

**‘The carceral’ in literary dystopia: Social conformity in Aldous Huxley’s
Brave New World, Jasper Fford’s *Shades of Grey* and Veronica Roth’s
Divergent Trilogy**

by

MARLIZE CHAMBERLAIN

submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the subject

ENGLISH STUDIES

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: Prof. F. Kalua

FEBRUARY 2020

DECLARATION

I declare that 'THE CARCERAL' IN LITERARY DYSTOPIA: SOCIAL CONFORMITY IN ALDOUS HUXLEY'S *BRAVE NEW WORLD*, JASPER FFORD'S *SHADES OF GREY* AND VERONICA ROTH'S *DIVERGENT* TRILOGY is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

I further declare that I submitted the dissertation to originality checking software and that it falls within the accepted requirements for originality.

I further declare that I have not previously submitted this work, or part of it, for examination at Unisa for another qualification or at any other higher education institution.

SUMMARY

This dissertation examines how three dystopian texts, namely Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, Jasper Fforde's *Shades of Grey* and Veronica Roth's *Divergent* trilogy, exhibit social conformity as a disciplinary mechanism of the 'carceral' – a notion introduced by poststructuralist thinker Michel Foucault. Employing poststructuralist discourse and deconstructive theory as a theoretical framework, the study investigates how each novel establishes its world as a successful carceral city that incorporates most, if not all, the elements of the incarceration system that Foucault highlights in *Discipline and Punish*. It establishes that the societies of the texts present potentially nightmarish future societies in which social and political "improvements" result in a seemingly better world, yet some essential part of human existence has been sacrificed. This study of these fictional worlds reflects on the carceral nature of modern society and highlights the problematic nature of the social and political practices to which individuals are expected to conform. Finally, in line with Foucault, it postulates that individuals need not be enclosed behind prison walls to be imprisoned; the very nature of our social systems imposes the restrictive power that incarcerates societies.

KEY TERMS

Dystopia; Utopia; Science fiction; Social systems; Social conformity; Post-structuralism; Michael Foucault; Jacques Derrida; Future societies; Satire; Prison; Dystopian fiction; Young Adult Dystopian Fiction; Imprisonment; Power; Hegemony; Discipline; Docility; Carceral; Discourse; Discursive formations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	13
CHAPTER 2: ALDOUS HUXLEY’S <i>BRAVE NEW WORLD</i>	46
CHAPTER 3: JASPER FFORDE’S <i>SHADES OF GREY</i>	68
CHAPTER 4: VERONICA ROTH’S <i>DIVERGENT</i> TRILOGY	94
CONCLUSION.....	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	123

INTRODUCTION

In Michel Foucault's exploration of the history and philosophy behind the modern prison in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977), he introduces the idea of 'the carceral', a distinctly dystopian notion that suggests that modern society itself is like a prison. As a notion, 'the carceral' can be understood as "[t]he generality of the punitive function that the eighteenth century sought in the 'ideological' technique of representations and signs" (Foucault 1977: 299). This punitive function "generalized in the sphere of meaning the function that the carceral generalized in the sphere of tactics" (1977: 300). This means that 'the carceral', as notion, can be understood as a network of strategies that links punitive practices with ideological representations. In modern society, "official power depends more and more on the ability to acquire a constant flow of information about the activities of the subjects of that power" (Booker 1994: 26). This suggests that in a carceral society, individuals are constantly involved in large, invisible structures of official power. It is the ubiquitous nature of this power and the disciplinary mechanisms of the power relations pervading the individual's social reality that make carceral societies dystopian, and dystopian societies carceral.

The outbreak of the Black Death in the fourteenth century had a devastating effect on Europe and, later, on mankind itself. Its mortality rate was of such a near-apocalyptic scale that mankind was forced to reconsider many aspects of its existing systems in order to ensure its survival. By the end of the seventeenth century, with several epidemics occurring around the world, steps to limit the spread and mortality rate of the plague were taken whenever there was an outbreak. As there is to this day no cure for the plague, the only way the catastrophic aftermath of an epidemic could be minimised was confinement and disciplinary projects. Consequently, when plague broke out in a town, it would be sealed off and individuals would be confined to designated places. Surveillance and inspections were constant and findings were thoroughly reported and documented. These were all disciplinary mechanisms put in place to protect society from what was perceived as possible extinction. In this way, the chaos of a deadly epidemic could be curbed so that a potentially cataclysmic event could be averted. However, this came at a price – an intensification and expansion of power.

Foucault states: "Behind the disciplinary mechanisms can be read the haunting memory of 'contagions', of the plague, of rebellions, crimes, vagabondage, desertions, people who appear and disappear, live and die in disorder" (1977: 198). This statement connects the disciplinary

measures of plague quarantine to the disciplinary mechanisms of a dystopian society. The outbreak of a massive disaster such as the plague can be seen as representative of an extraordinary world-ending event in which power is mobilised in order to initiate the societies of Huxley's *Brave New World*, Fforde's *Shades of Grey* and Roth's *Divergent* trilogy to seek out means to protect themselves from the recurrence of such an event. The haunting memory of the world-ending event is the driving force behind the establishment of alternative modes of societal design: these are a means of maintaining a disciplined society in order to make it "the utopia of the perfectly governed city" (Foucault 1977: 198). However, such a city cannot be established without people being constantly subject to the exercise of autonomous power.

Foucault argues that the technologies of power embedded in the institutions of incarceration give modern society its carceral nature, thereby making life inside and outside prison the same. This view has a direct link to the social criticism embedded in dystopian literature and is the principal reason why Foucault's work, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977) provides the primary theoretical basis for this dissertation. Foucault's model of the carceral city is used here as a metaphor for internalised surveillance and disciplinary practices that limit the freedom of people in the same way that a prison does. The carceral contains "a multiple network of diverse elements – walls, space, institution, rules, discourse" (Foucault 1977: 307), which in essence, is a tactical dispersal of different types of elements. More importantly, society as a whole contains several carceral mechanisms "which tend, like the prison, to exercise the power of normalization" (Foucault 1977: 308). This means that the focus falls not on violent force, but on the ability to restrict and alter the will of not only the prisoner, but also of the citizen outside the prison walls.

This dissertation examines how Huxley's *Brave New World* (henceforth *BNW*), Fforde's *Shades of Grey* and Roth's *Divergent* trilogy highlight the flaws of societal structure and the division of classes through vigorous social stratification. The aim is to explore how the instituted social systems achieve conformity through *passive coercion*, rather than through conventional means of brutally enforced militaristic practices. By looking at the methods used to discipline society to conform to prescribed norms, this dissertation explores how the texts expose the carceral nature, not only of their fictional societies, but also of modern society.

Dystopian novels deal with and express concerns about economic, moral and political crises of contemporary society through the use of alternative, yet still very flawed, societal designs of

futuristic worlds. Moreover, a primary function of dystopian fiction is to act as a critique of existing systems, whether political or social, and to provide “fresh perspectives on problematic social and political practices” (Booker 1994: 19). Contrary to the positive and impossible hopes presented in utopian texts, dystopias postulate potential futures as actual possibilities in which social and political ‘improvements’ result in societies that are seemingly stable and happy, but their ‘perfection’ could only be accomplished by means of sacrificing some precious part of human existence, most often freedom and individuality. By using poststructuralist theory and methods, this dissertation deconstructs the utopian ideals presented in the selected texts that clearly place them within the dystopian literary canon. It then focuses specifically on the instituted disciplinary mechanisms that have the principal function of imposing conformity as a means of pacification and acceptance of the state-sanctioned ‘normal’.

In Chapter 1 details of the background and development of the utopian/dystopian literary canon are provided. The genre is defined, as various scholars have expanded on the idea of dystopian strategies used in literature as a means of coming to terms with the changing social reality of the modern world (Baccolini & Moylan 2003: 3). What is important is that these scholars stipulate that, although many literary dystopias share some of the structural and stylistic elements of what can be considered the classic utopian model, they do, however, employ specific formal strategies that distinguish them from literary utopias. Such texts usually comprise a narrative that examines the hegemonic order of a society with a distinctive fictional, social, and political reality. The focus of my study falls mainly on the flaws of this seemingly perfect society. The study also focuses on characters who question and resist the power struggles within the dystopian society. This creates an opposition between utopia and dystopia, thereby creating a critical space in which social and political criticism can be examined.

Because the dystopian narrative contains the structural strategy that focuses on how hegemonic control is exercised, both through coercion and consent (Baccolini & Moylan 2003: 5), I use poststructuralist theory as the lens through which the selected texts are analysed. French poststructuralist philosophers Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida are two of the main contributors to poststructuralism and their philosophies are used as the theoretical framework in this dissertation. Foucault’s works have exerted a huge influence on many disciplines, including psychology, history, sociology, philosophy and literary theory and criticism. The primary focus of Foucault’s most important work is the genealogy of particular discourses.

Many competing discourses characterise society; discourse analysis is thus suitable when examining struggles over meaning and power conflicts between classes and genders or between the state and its subjects. Foucault's use of the term discourse is critical to this study's focus on dystopian texts because the utopian/dystopian genre depends on existing examples of language used in the areas of knowledge that pertain particularly to that genre. The vocabulary and knowledge contained within the text itself provides a means of understanding how conformity shapes not only the reality of that particular dystopian setting, but also the behaviour of its characters. By examining the discourse of dystopian texts, readers who are not part of that fictional world can form an understanding of how its social and political systems operate.

This dissertation views the texts in question primarily from the perspective of Foucault's views of discourse as a function of institutional power. The modern discourse of power, discipline and punishment is examined from the perspective of Foucault's study of prisons as set out in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977) (henceforth *Discipline and Punish*), in which he introduces the idea of 'the carceral', the central concept of this dissertation. Foucault contends that modern society is itself carceral in nature. He argues that the prison system is not designed to eradicate crime, but rather to establish a well-identified, observable population of delinquents who can be kept within the socially and politically accepted parameters of conduct. As part of the theoretical framework, Chapter 1 elaborates on Foucault's findings in *Discipline and Punish* on how institutions of power such as the prison came about and what the incarceration system and its various carceral mechanisms reveal about how power operates in a society. The disciplinary methods in institutions of incarceration provide the primary foundation for a dystopian world's being equated to that of a prison. Foucault's concept of the carceral is useful in terms of real-world conditions and the resulting effect of disciplining citizens into submitting to the systems established by the ruling class.

Chapter 1 also discusses Jacques Derrida's deconstructive theory of textual analysis in the philosophical and literary canon. It discusses Derrida's notions of the "metaphysics of presence" (1998: 22) and the notion of *différance* (1998: 23). Derrida postulates meaning can only be determined when readers distinguish the differences between words and things. In a deconstructive reading, all the various interpretations of characters, events and images are noted; the ways in which these interpretations conflict with each other are presented and the ways in which these conflicts produce even more interpretations are exposed (Tyson 1999:

252). Therefore, a deconstructive reading can be considered a type of double reading, the first being a faithful attempt to follow the prevailing interpretation of the text, the second being the location of its repressed interpretation (Rasinski 2011: 11). In this way, a deconstructive reading acknowledges how order is accomplished by a writer and indicates the contradictions and complications arising in the text from the imposed mechanisms of the writer's ideologically saturated ordering-strategies. Therefore, Derrida's deconstructive theory is used to identify and examine the internal contradictions within the text in order to explore the tension between utopian and dystopian notions.

In the chapters that follow, this dissertation uses discourse analysis and post-structuralism theory to investigate how each novel establishes its world as a successful carceral city that incorporates most, if not all, the elements of the incarceration system that Foucault highlights in *Discipline and Punish*.

Chapter 2 examines how social conformity gives the society of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* its carceral nature. This famous novel contains the mechanisms that embody the discourse of discipline and power present in most dystopian settings. In its carceral city, autonomy has been sacrificed for stability and happiness. Family and marriage have been abolished and procreation has been replaced by genetic engineering and sexual promiscuity. Poverty, disease and war have been eradicated and biological manipulation, indoctrination and the drug-taking ensure productive and compliant behaviour. The two main characters, Bernard Marx and John Savage, function as the forces of resistance as they express scepticism towards World State's seemingly utopian society. Bernard Marx struggles to conform completely to his society's 'normal' and John Savage finds it impossible to understand and fit in with societal norms that are vastly different from his own ideological beliefs.

The main carceral mechanism of this society is its utilisation of genetic engineering and behavioural conditioning to create class-based docile bodies that are completely compliant. They react as prototypes of their class without critical thought and accept and obey the rules and requirements of their caste system intuitively. This creates a homogeneous society characteristic of utopian civilisations; Huxley criticises this homogeneity by not only stripping individuals of individuality and agency, but also by establishing an awareness of the artificiality of such an existence within the character of John Savage.

The suppression of individuality is not the only means by which Huxley's World State maintains its carceral ideology. Typical of many dystopias, the state preserves its own existence by suppressing its own history. This is accomplished by promoting the universal conviction that the existing circumstances are normal and have never been different. By keeping citizens not only docile but also ignorant, the World State can maintain its control over the population for an indefinite period, as the possibility of resistance is minimised by the established disciplinary methods.

Thus, Huxley presents the possible price that humanity could pay for establishing a perfectly stable future society. The loss of individual freedom to be unique individuals with free thought and agency is what could well keep human beings incarcerated.

Chapter 3 examines the carceral nature of the satirical society in Jasper Fforde's *Shades of Grey*. While the carceral disciplinary methods in this society are very similar to those of *Brave New World*, the world itself, the plot and the characters are vastly different. The power of discourse to create a world is magnificently displayed in this unique novel as Fforde invests a great deal of time in introducing and developing his newly imagined concepts and world features. The novel is set in the distant future, 496 years after the "Something that Happened" (2009: 9), a cataclysmic event responsible for the establishment of this new alternative societal structure. People are able to see certain colours only and, consequently, all aspects of this society, from a person's name and social standing to city names, medicines and food, are categorised and prioritised according to colour. The ability to see certain colours is a commodity that determines the wealth and social status of individuals within the Collective; society maintains a strict social hierarchy that is based on one's ability to see certain colours. This hierarchy, known as the Colortocracy, places the Purples at the top of the social hierarchy, followed by the Blues, the Greens, Yellows, Oranges, and Reds, and lastly the monochromatic Greys.

Foucault argues that because so many institutions place great emphasis on collecting information and knowledge about individuals, "prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons" (1977: 228). In case of *Shades of Grey*, Fforde's society resembles a prison because it employs a particular discourse that echoes that of a school. The governing system is appropriately based, in a literal sense, on the rule system of an English public school, where citizens are awarded merits and demerits, wear badges on their lapels and

are supervised by monitors and prefects. Perhaps most importantly, though, language and conduct are strictly regulated by the Rules in such a way that swearing is illegal and good manners are mandatory. In addition, to keep residents docile and ignorant, technology is very simplistic and strictly regulated by “Leapbacks”, periods in time in which certain aspects of civil life are banned indefinitely. In essence, people passively accept their way of life as they are constantly discouraged from being curious or asking questions.

Whereas Huxley’s novel criticises social conformity as a means of creating a homogeneously docile society, Fforde’s novel criticises social conformity as a means of suppressing that natural human inquisitiveness that has led humanity to innovative progression. Because social conformity ultimately suggests conforming to this society’s norm of ignorance, inquisitive individuals such as the protagonist, Eddie Russett, are consequently regarded as abnormal, or as the Foucauldian delinquent. They are dangerous in the sense that they jeopardise the longevity of the carceral nature of the Stasis and the novel portrays how various disciplinary mechanisms are in place to ensure that such delinquents are documented, monitored and, when necessary, permanently removed from society.

Fforde’s novel suggests that social conformity can bring about and maintain a carceral city when people are unaware of their own lack of freedom. It emphasises, through satirical criticism, that incarceration can take many forms when the correct disciplinary measures are in place.

Chapter 4 examines how social conformity shapes a carceral identity in Veronica Roth’s *Divergent* trilogy. This trilogy comprises *Divergent* (2011), *Insurgent* (2012) and *Allegiant* (2013). With the exception of some chapters in the third novel, the series is told from the first-person perspective of Beatrice “Tris” Prior, who lives in a society enclosed behind the gates of the futuristic dystopian city of Chicago. The societal structure is based on a faction system consisting of five factions, Amity, Candor, Erudite, Abnegation and Dauntless. Each faction, as its name suggests, is a representation of a particular virtue that is valued most by its community. Once an individual chooses a faction at the age of sixteen, that person is required to regard the selected faction as his/her new family and must conform to the social convictions and customs of that community. The first novel focuses on establishing the importance of conforming to the norms of one’s faction by following Tris’s initiation into the Dauntless faction. She discovers that she is Divergent, a classification given to those with a brain

chemistry that fits not into one single faction, but into many. By the third novel, Tris and her love interest, Four, have escaped to the world outside the gates enclosing Chicago where they make the shocking discovery that their way of life has been a human genetic experiment. They realise that the establishment of their enclosed city was the Bureau of Genetic Welfare's endeavour to rectify the failed attempt to eradicate the genetic vices of humanity that were believed to be the source of conflict and war. In this attempt to eliminate the genes deemed responsible for man's violent and destructive behaviour, unforeseen side-effects occurred. The experiment resulted in negative mutations that seemingly caused worse behaviour. A project was launched to identify and study people with a healed genome and eventually reintroduce these people back into the world.

Social conformity to the behavioural restrictions of the factions is primarily what gives this society its carceral nature. The novels effectively portray the restrictive power of hegemonic order most common in dystopias. Not only are people's thoughts and behaviour restricted by the values of their faction, but they are also unaware that they are part of a human experiment in which they are constantly being observed and documented. In effect, citizens of the future carceral city of Chicago are incarcerated by their social system *and* by the gates that keep them inside their city. The novels thus posit that not only can freedom be restricted through confinement but also through disciplinary methods that condition people to behave according to prescribed standards. These novels also examine those values that lie at the very core of human nature and make humans the complex unstable beings they are. In doing so, they open a critical space in which we can examine our own flaws and perhaps one day find a way to establish a better society.

CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This dissertation is a qualitative study that integrates literary analysis with relevant and critical theoretical support. The methodology followed is the analysis of dystopian science fiction novels through the use of the Foucauldian and Derridean versions of poststructuralist theory, while focusing on the discourse of disciplinary power in punitive practises as presented by Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* (1977).

From as early as the publication of Plato's *Republic* (370-80 BC) and St. Augustine's *City of God* (410-425 AD), utopian thinking has been closely affiliated with literary texts. As Booker states, "Utopian visions are in a fundamental sense literary in character" (1994: 14). Moreover, utopian literary texts are not merely a disconnected means of escapism, but play an active role in reality in such a profound way that the social and political change that these texts postulate may very well serve as influential blueprints for future social and political reform. Indeed, the tremendous social and political confusion of the Renaissance conceived utopianism not in concept, but in name, with the publication of Thomas More's *Utopia* in 1516. Not only did More's text bring with it, in both text and form, a new genre, but more interestingly, it attempted "to intervene in its contemporary historical moment by indicating desirable directions" that the situational changes of the Renaissance period might have taken (Booker 1994: 14).

Because utopian and dystopian visions are "very much part of the same project" (Booker 1994: 15), before dystopian texts can be examined it is important to trace the inspiration of their creation back to their influential origin. Plato's *Republic* (370-380 BCE) is known among scholars as the earliest fictional depiction of an ideal, not real, society. *Kallipolis*, the name Socrates uses for Plato's utopian city-state, consists of a highly regulated, class-based society. Essential to the successful functioning of this society is the requirement that each person fulfils his/her societal role as a guardian (ruler), an auxiliary (warrior / military), a producer (workers, artisans, farmers) or slave, thus forming a "functional hierarchy" (Gerber, in Devido 2012: 7-8). Only by specialising in one's role in the just structure of the city can it be ensured that each job function is optimally fulfilled. Other characteristics of the social structure of Plato's city-state include shared responsibility by males and females, regulated procreation, expendable working-class members and the terminally ill, who are not treated but left to die for the greater

good. Moreover, activities associated with raw human emotional impulses such as passion and desire are seen as harmful and strongly discouraged.

Plato's *Republic* provided Thomas More with a societal model for his *Utopia* (1516). 'Utopia' is the word More used for both the name of the island that acts as the setting of the book as well as for the work's title. The word utopia is a paradoxical term, a combination of two Greek words that can mean either 'no place' or 'good place', indicating that such a society is simultaneously a fictitious place that does not exist, and an ideal place that can be created. Employing the narrative structure of popular travel narratives of the Middle Ages, More depicts the fictitious ideal of a perfect society that is based on concepts of equality, social unity, economic opulence and political stability. Such a community is dependent on controlling individual impulses, such as owning private property or wearing different clothes, not only as a means of minimising the destructive influence that the envy of wealth and social status may have on a society, but also to limit poverty, hunger, violence and other social problems. These are still common today and believed by many to be the direct causes of instability and unrest. In most cases, a utopian society is governed by a set of strict laws that forces its citizens to repress aspects of their human nature in order to conform to societal norms, in order to keep the society stable.

Both Plato and More intended to suggest that an alternative means of organising society can be imagined, and is therefore possible to bring about in reality. More's text envisions a society that is an ideal state of existence, "essentially in opposition to the prevailing ideology" (Vieira 2010: 6) because this society adopts a new ideology that flawlessly presents its citizens with a better, ideal life. Ironically, the functioning of More's utopian society depends on slave labour and extreme social control that limits individual freedom, which, of course, is not characteristic of an ideal society as it would be perceived today.

More's island of Utopia is separated from the known world, a characteristic that would make possible the maintenance of the stability of its societal organisation, should such a society be established. In this apparently classless society, each household consists of forty adults and two slaves and is overseen by a "Styward", or District Controller, who ensures that the household keeps working and remains productive. These District Controllers elect a Mayor, who enjoys his elevated position for the remainder of his life. The most prominent position is that of the priests, who have numerous important responsibilities and, in turn, enjoy a privileged and

superior position that awards them rights that are not bestowed upon the rest of society. Citizens who cannot produce efficiently for the good of society, such as the elderly and the mentally ill, are ostracised or euthanised.

The concept of utopia thus suggests “imaginary paradisiacal places” and, at the same time, refers “to a particular kind of narrative, which became known as utopian literature” (Vieira 2010: 4). Traditionally, the narrative structure of a utopian text follows the same narrative structure as More’s *Utopia*. For example, a character journeys to an unknown place and is guided through the city. The organisation of the social, political, religious and economic mechanisms are revealed and explained to both character and reader. Often, through the conventions of travel literature, the reader is introduced to the speculative discourse of the author’s own imaginative and improved social organisation. The meaning of unique concepts that belong only to the discourse of this society is either explained, or can be deduced from the context.

The utopian texts that followed More’s *Utopia* included many features that became common conventions of the utopian genre. Some of these conventions are an isolated, often imagined, place such as an island or gated community, or a place located in a different time – often labelled as a eudaimonia. The society of such a place is fully functioning and has established social and political systems that ensure that society is thriving. Lastly, usually through the use of irony, utopian texts seem aware of their own paradoxes, thereby containing a built-in critique of the utopian ideals themselves.

These utopian conventions are important because, on the one hand, they have become a rhetorical blueprint for actions that should be considered when establishing a perfect society. On the other hand, these conventions are also important because they have been adopted, to a certain degree, by the dystopian genre, which is in direct contrast to the utopian genre, but with the rhetorical function of acting as a warning of what the consequences may be when humanity attempts to establish a utopia. Utopian and dystopian notions are therefore intertwined, as they use different rhetorical methods with identifiable conventions to respond to the same social anxieties.

The failure to establish a stable and classless Marxist society during the rise of socialism “provoke[d] the death of utopian thought” and “forced its transformation” (Vieira 2010: 14).

The idea of establishing a perfect place transformed into the fear of establishing the worst place when communist totalitarianism suggested the nightmarish possibilities of the actual establishment of a utopian society. The years that followed World War I and World War II marked a grave period for humanity, one in which the confidence in man's ability to create a better world was shattered by totalitarian oppression. Keith Booker and other scholars maintain that twentieth-century totalitarianism is the "phenomenon that provides the basis for many dystopian fictions" (Booker 1994: 10). It is the profound impact that this period had on humanity and societal evolution that caused anti-utopian fiction to flourish, as it echoed specific fears and anxieties in the cultural context from which it was produced. This resulted in positive utopian thinking changing to negative and the term *utopia* being tainted by its association with totalitarianism. Moreover, the concept of hope for a perfect world turned into disbelief and despair in the literary utopias of the nineteenth century when writers and scholars considered the idea and the future of scientific and technological development. This resulted in anti-utopian feelings and a questioning of the utopian spirit, expressed in explicit disbelief in the possibility of realising the utopian ideals of philosophers such as Karl Marx (Booker 1994: 3-5).

English philosopher John Stuart Mill coined the term dystopia "for a perspective which was opposite to that of utopia" (Vieira 2010: 16). Dystopian literature, therefore, is a class of anti-utopian literature that generally satirises utopian philosophy by referring to fictional societies that are immensely imperfect, where utopian elements such as intense social control are exaggerated and their negative effects are highlighted. Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan argue that "most dystopian texts offer a detailed and pessimistic presentation of the very worst of social alternatives" (Baccolini & Moylan 2003: 6). As literary forms, utopian and dystopian literatures employ similar strategies and "narrative artifices" (Vieira 2010: 16), despite being on opposite sides of the spectrum. Wegner proposes that

in the 'Utopian satire', where the spirit of utopianism is ridiculed, the vision offered in the text is meant as 'a criticism of that contemporary society'; while in the 'anti-Utopian' it serves 'as a criticism of Utopianism. (2005: 81)

These utopias, Vieira believes, are often labelled "critical dystopias" and their aim "is didactic and moralistic" (Vieira 2010: 17).

For Vieira, “critical dystopias” function as a means to “make man realise that, since it is impossible for him to build an ideal society, then he must be committed to the construction of a better one” (Vieira 2010:17). This is because critical dystopias depict

a non-existing society described in considerable detail and normally located in time and space that the author intended a contemporaneous reader to view as worse than contemporary society but that normally includes at least one utopian enclave or holds out hope that the dystopia can be overcome and replaced with a eutopia. (Sargent in Baccolini & Moylan 2003: 7)

This means that although the society of the text may seem nightmarish, the text may still contain some hopeful elements that suggest the means by which these nightmarish circumstances may be overcome.

Critical dystopias thus maintain a utopian impulse because, although there is not much hope in the novel, they maintain utopian hope beyond their pages. This pertains particularly to dystopias written in the past three decades. These novels deal with and express concerns about economic, moral and political crises in contemporary society through the use of alternative, yet still very flawed, societal designs for possible futuristic worlds. Moreover, the focus of many of the more recent contemporary works falls heavily on alternative social systems as a means of change. This is perhaps because the most dominant contemporary social arrangements subject entire sectors of the world’s population to poverty, untimely death, alienation, subjugation, enmity and separation from others to such an extent that the full human experience seems impossible to reach.

It can therefore be postulated that the primary function of dystopian fiction is to act as a critique of existing systems, whether political or social, and to provide “fresh perspectives on problematic social and political practices” (Booker 1994: 19). Contrary to the positive and impossible hopes presented in utopian texts, dystopias postulate potential futures as actual possibilities in which social and political ‘improvements’ result in societies that are seemingly stable and happy, but whose ‘perfection’ can only be accomplished by means of sacrificing some precious part of human existence, most often freedom and individuality.

The two primary aspects that have dominated dystopian discourse throughout its development are those of totalitarianism and scientific and technological advancement. For this reason, the

role of science fiction within the dystopian canon should not be ignored. The concept of ‘critical dystopia’ is strongly associated with Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan’s collection *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination* (2003), as well as Moylan’s *Scraps of Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia* (2000). Baccolini’s definition of critical dystopia establishes these texts as ones “that ‘maintain a utopian core’ and yet help ‘to deconstruct tradition and reconstruct alternatives’” (Baccolini in Fitting 2009: 127). This means that although the hope of establishing the perfect place remains present, traditional approaches are abandoned in favour of new and imaginative ones.

Booker observes: “Science has played a major role in the history of utopian thinking and in the modern turn from utopia to dystopia” (Booker 1997: 5). More’s founding work of the genre (*Utopia* 1516) and even earlier works by Francis Bacon and Plato recognise the potential revolutionary possibilities – albeit alleviative, disruptive or corruptive – of scientific and technological advancement. Science fiction, then, is “a mode or field where different genres and subgenres intersect” (Seed 2011: 1). It has a “hybrid nature” as well as a “speculative dimension” in which “these narratives position themselves between possibility and impossibility” (Seed 2011: 1). Of particular significance to this study is the notion that science fiction and dystopian studies converge in their function as social criticism rather than as the presence and practice of science as the principal matter.

Among the many noted literary critics in the fields of science fiction and dystopian studies, Marxist scholar Darko Suvin’s concept of ‘cognitive estrangement’ was a “pioneering attempt to identify the distinctive practices of SF [science fiction]” (Seed 2011: 128). Cognitive estrangement is a term amended from Victor Shklovsky’s term ‘defamiliarization’, a stylistic strategy and technique that makes a familiar concept seem strange, or new, in order to aid in not only creating new and imaginative concepts, but also to assist in the understanding of such concepts. In the case of science fiction utopia and dystopia, “cognitive estrangement” is the “main formal device” of science fiction and “an imaginative framework alternative to the author’s empirical environment” (Suvin in Shippy 2005: 15). Through this device, it is possible for the reader to ascertain what a unique concept within the text’s discourse may suggest. Thus, for example, when a text mentions something called simulation serum, and the reader is familiar with the meaning of the individual words in his/her own discourse, it is possible to defamiliarise the individual concepts in order to ascertain the complete and new concept within the discourse of the text.

Suvin defines Utopia as “the construction of a particular community where socio-political institutions, norms and relationships between people are organized according to a radically different principle than in the author’s community” (2003: 188). He goes on to say that if a creatively fabricated community is not based primarily on socio-political but on other fundamentally different tenets such as biological or geological principles, such a community is a science fictional community. This classification places the societies of all three of the selected novels within the dystopian science fiction genre. Their societies are established as part of the transformational process of establishing alternative societal structures. The alternative space that they occupy “is not empty, but has rules, structures, constraints, expectations of its own, and it is the positive presence of these... that enables change” (Levitas & Sargisson 2003: 19). Therefore, through the alternative structures that societies in these novels use, it becomes possible for the reader to consider alternative ways of thinking and being as he or she is exposed to another logic of action and understanding that is comprehensible.

Booker and Suvin both claim that the negative image of utopian dreaming as a form of escapism, and the positive image of utopian thought as the ideal Platonic possibility are aptly represented by the filtered fables and fairytales of Disneyland. By combining fantasy and technology, Disneyland represents the dual nature of the utopian project that is of such importance to this study. The park is run smoothly and efficiently and crowds stream from one meticulously scheduled attraction to another. Blissfully docile masses are watched by uniformed cartoon overseers, and are willing to spend enormous amounts of money on useless items as a means of announcing openly that they are fully enveloped in this utopian experience.

This scenario is an example of what Suvin calls “Disneyfication as Dystopia” (2003: 194). Parks such as Disneyland represent “a negative escapism that is specifically designed to divert attention from social problems in the ‘real world’” (Booker 1994: 2). Essentially, Disneyland effectively conceals its amplification of commodity dominance. Added to this, it constantly reinforces and solidifies a “false consciousness that injects the hegemonic bourgeois version of U.S. normality into people’s neurons by ‘naturalizing’” (Suvin 2003: 194). Just as prisons conceal the fact that society in its entirety is what is carceral, so too does Disneyland conceal that it is in fact the entire American country that is Disneyland. Booker also notes that the docility with which visitors to Disneyland conform to conventions of consumer behaviour and succumb to coercion is not only frightening but, more importantly, a display of the “idealization

of the American dream and the ideal carceral society of consumer capitalism” (Booker 1994: 3).

Two aspects of the Disneyfication strategy that are of interest to this study are its conditioning of consumer behaviour and its infantilisation of adults. As a psychological effect, Disneyfication produces a constant demand to complement a continuously repeated offer. As will be investigated in the analysis of Huxley’s *Brave New World*, infantilisation “rejects any intervention into the real world that would make the pursuit of happiness collectively attainable” (Suvín 2003: 194). It also “rejects any reality constriction of one’s desire, however shallow or destructive” (Suvín 2003: 194). This means that Disneyfication endorses limitless pleasure-seeking and fulfilment of unconstrained infantile desires. Finally, Suvín argues that Disneyland is a trap for desire and a false Other. It embodies the duality of utopian thought that highlights the notion that one person’s ideal dream may indeed constitute another person’s nightmare; one person’s paradise may also be another person’s prison.

Suvín observes that a central concept that occurs in science fiction is that of the novum, “a discrete piece of information recognisable as not-true, but also as not-unlike-true, not-flatly-impossible (Suvín in Shippy 2010: 14). The use of ‘defamiliarisation’ or ‘cognitive estrangement’ can be viewed as a deconstructive tool that unveils real-world truths when the familiar is made strange to the reader and reality is, in turn, viewed in profoundly different ways. This is because the concepts of the novum and of cognitive estrangement evidently evoke the poststructuralist ideas of Derrida’s *différance*, to be discussed later, as well as Foucault’s discursive formations. All these concepts stress the importance of perspective and the interplay of differing meanings between the reader’s world and the fictional worlds.

Radwan (2017: 151) highlights the main characteristics of science fiction dystopia as set out by Booker and Thomas in *The Science Fiction Handbook* (2009). These characteristics have come to classify the conventions of contemporary dystopian novels’ fictional worlds. Essentially, these worlds include some, if not all, of the following conventional tropes: authoritative and imposed control, dehumanisation, conformity and preoccupation with state-sanctioned, disingenuous entertainment. By using a poststructuralist theoretical framework and methods, this study deconstructs the utopian ideals presented in the selected texts that appear to place them within the dystopian literary canon. It then focuses specifically on the instituted

social mechanisms that have the principal intention of establishing conformity as a means of subtly coercing individuals to accept the established ‘normal’.

Viewed by scholars as the “canonical dystopias” (Vieira 2010: 18), Yevgeny Zamyati’s *We* (1921), George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) and Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* (1932) present societies in which scientific and technological progress have been instrumental in establishing autocratic regimes. These three novels are known as the founding texts by which generations of authors have been inspired to create their own imagined dystopian worlds. It is therefore important to include at least one of these texts in this dissertation, namely Huxley’s *Brave New World* as it will function as a type of baseline against which the other contemporary texts can be measured. Many studies and writings on this novel by various scholars have emerged since its first publication in 1932, only a few of the most relevant which will be mentioned here.

In her introduction to *Brave New World* (henceforth *BNW*), Margaret Atwood juxtaposes it with George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a means to distinguish between two types of dystopias. She aptly names the first type of dystopia represented by *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a “boot grinding into the human face” dystopia, whereas *Brave New World* represents the second, “a different and softer form of totalitarianism – one of conformity” (Huxley 1994: vii). This distinction is important for the purposes of this dissertation as studies on the dystopian genre tend to be focused on evaluating and criticising the authoritarian power that wields the metaphorical boot of the oppressive ruling class. Her distinction is helpful as it justifies this study’s intent to shift the focus away from traditional views of violent and forceful mechanisms of control, popular in dystopian studies, towards an examination of passive mechanisms of coercion and subjugation as a means of control. It is also helpful in terms of establishing the fact that the two other types of dystopia to be examined in this dissertation can also be classified, like *Brave New World*, as soft dystopias and can therefore be measured against the same criteria.

As he has written extensively in the field of dystopian fiction, Keith Booker’s work has been cited by numerous scholars. Booker calls *Brave New World* the “classic bourgeois dystopia” (1994: 48). He argues that early twentieth-century dystopian novels like *BNW* “suggested that bourgeois society can perpetuate its power through far more subtle means” (1994: 48). This type of subtle power is maintained through a devotion to capitalist ideals, hedonistic pleasure,

advanced technological sophistication and indoctrination programmes. Booker believes that because this society's social mechanisms are designed "to promote a hedonistic pursuit of pleasure", society is pacified because "the buildup of potentially subversive political energies" (1994: 49) is prevented. Furthermore, and of particular interest to this dissertation, Booker argues that conformity "is largely enforced through the proliferation of a passive mindlessness that renders the citizens incapable of the thought or feeling required to question models provided for them by the ruling World Controllers" (1994: 57). It is this "passive mindlessness" that will be linked to Foucault's concept of "docile bodies" (1977: 135) later in this chapter.

Booker also stresses the role that science plays in Huxley's World Government: "official propaganda ... glorifies science as a central value of the society" and science "in Huxley's dystopian regime involves little more than a complex of practices designed specifically to help the World Controllers assure the cooperation and obedience of the general population" (1994: 49). Most importantly, Booker argues that contemporary scientific and technological advancements in fields such as industrial engineering, genetics, medicine, psychology, computers and communications make a future dystopian world like Huxley's ever more imaginable in future decades.

While Booker focuses on the dystopian impulse in modern literature, David Seed's focus is more on science fiction. Seed, believes that *BNW* is "the single most famous science fiction novel to describe genetic engineering" (2010: 477). Seed also highlights the fact that *BNW* was Huxley's attempt to criticise the entire concept of the Wellsian Utopia as the novel criticises the idea of an omnipotent World State. Together with *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, and Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859), H.G. Wells' *A Modern Utopia* (1905) is the founding influence on themes of many dystopias, in particular Huxley's *BNW*. In *A Modern Utopia*, Wells uses a "hybrid method combining narrative and theoretical discussion" (Seed 2011: 78). Wells' speculations on future dystopian societies provide the conventions that modern authors use in the depiction of their societies. His contribution to the dystopian literary canon gives contemporary works their "speculative dimension" and allows them to "recognise the lure of attempting to correct the perceived messiness of the world" (Seed 2011: 79).

Huxley's visit to the United States of America in 1926 was the key experience that shaped *BNW*, Seed believes. He claims that American culture had such a profound influence on Huxley

as it revealed to him a “revaluation of values, a radical alteration (for the worse) of established standards” (Seed 2010: 479). For Huxley, Americanisation is the final phase of establishing a World State that is determined by economic and socioeconomic conditions. This is a principal concern that he expresses in *BNW*.

Seed’s remarks on *BNW*’s “evocation of a technologically streamlined society” (2011: 486), the influence that the Wellsian Utopia had on Huxley and the concerns regarding changes in the established standards of societal design, are particularly salient to the purposes of this study.

The second primary text selected for this dissertation is *Shades of Grey* (2009) by Jasper Fforde. This unique and imaginative novel is included in this dissertation for very specific reasons; the first is for its satirical nature and the second is that it functions as a bridge between what is considered the classic and conventional dystopia, and the now very popular young adult dystopian novel. This bridge provides a significant contribution to the study as Roth’s trilogy, analysed in Chapter 4, has been popularly classified as young adult fiction. However, the connection that young adult dystopian novels have with the dystopian genre in terms of conventions is strong enough that the novels’ strict classification as young adult or adult becomes irrelevant to the purposes of this dissertation as young adult dystopias still contain the numerous dystopian conventions associated with the genre. Finally, the social system depicted in this novel is unique in the sense that it employs the mechanisms of the school disciplinary system as its social and political system. Because Foucault maintains that the carceral mechanisms of prisons have pervaded other institutions, including schools, to study a dystopian world that incorporates the carceral mechanisms of the school disciplinary system as its dominant societal governing system presents a unique opportunity for academic investigation.

Very little has been written on this novel for a variety of reasons. Although a popular author, Jasper Fforde’s popularity lies in his *Thursday Next* series of novels and therefore most scholars who give attention to his work focus on these novels. *Shades of Grey* was also announced to be a trilogy and yet, since its publication in 2009, Fforde has not published any of the promised follow-up novels. Given the tendency of young adult dystopian novels to be adapted to film, it is to be hoped that his *Shades of Grey* series will soon be completed and receive the same recognition and popularity as other young adult dystopian novels written this century.

Despite this lack of attention from popular scholars, the novel has found its way into recent academic theses that have been devoted to either young adult dystopian fiction or contemporary dystopian fiction in general. One such thesis is by Alexandra Bodnaruk, is entitled “Constructing Literary Dystopia: exploring the divide between young adult and adult dystopian fictions”. In her study, Bodnaruk compared two adult dystopian novels, *Oryx and Crake* by Margaret Atwood and *The Road* by Cormac McCarthy, to two young adult dystopian novels, *Uglies* by Scott Westerfeld and *Shades of Grey* by Jasper Fforde. She maintains that “the young adult dystopian texts approach the same political issues as their adult counterparts” (Bodnaruk 2014: 4). Regarding *Shades of Grey*, she argues that the novel demonstrates that “critical engagement with the dystopian genre is not entirely absent from YA [young adult] dystopian novels” (2014: 47). She believes that the novel allows for critique because it “points out numerous conventions of the dystopian genre” (2014: 48). Useful to this study is the fact that her thesis reveals that both young adult and adult dystopian fiction “demonstrate the importance of characterisation and perspective on the resulting interpretation of the literary dystopia by the reader” (2014: 11). This suggests that when the novels are analysed and a particular perspective, such as poststructuralist thinking, is applied, the distinction between adult and young adult dystopia becomes irrelevant as both types of dystopias apply the same conventions.

Jasper Fforde himself devotes an entire website to *Shades of Grey*. With colourful language as quirky as his novels, the author explains the mechanics of Chromatacia – the known world of this novel – and provides insight into the inspirations behind his thinking throughout the creation of this novel. His website is particularly useful in this study, as he expands on many of the strange concepts that the novel incorporates into its bizarre world. The author also admits to Huxley’s *BNW* being one of the primary literary influences on his novel and also admits that his intention was to make the forces of oppression in this novel subtler and more internal than those of *BNW* and Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

The final primary text studied in this dissertation is the *Divergent* trilogy by Veronica Roth. This series of novels is relatively new, the last in the trilogy being published in 2013 and the last of its film adaptations released in 2017. The series forms part of the Young Adult (YA) dystopian genre that has been rising in popularity since the late 2000s, even amongst adult readers. This popularity, has made it necessary to give the novels in this genre critical academic attention, and Roth’s *Divergent* series has become steadily more prominent in contemporary YA dystopian academic studies.

An important study is Sara Buggy's thesis that focuses on the body and its role in the exertion of and resistance to disciplinary power in contemporary YA dystopian fiction, particularly works featuring female protagonists. Although her focus and approach are vastly different from that of this study, her application of Foucauldian theory to the analysis of selected texts, among others Roth's *Divergent*, and her analysis of these texts, highlight some relevant aspects regarding subtle power structures within dystopian contexts. Her investigation into Roth's depiction of social identity formation and the role power plays in the formation of identity proved useful to this study.

Suzanne Roszak's article evaluates aspects of division, cultural hybridity and ethnic injustice in Veronica Roth's *Divergent* and Sandra Cisneros's *The House on Mango Street* (1984), in terms of how these novels challenge instances of social injustice. She argues that novels such as *Divergent* "echo patterns of racial and ethnic inequity" (2016: 62) and draw implicit parallels that encourage young readers "to cultivate general values such as tolerance of difference and nonhierarchical thinking" (2016: 61). This suggests that the social division that the novel portrays can be equated to racial segregation. Useful to this dissertation is Roszak's statement that *Divergent* shows that "social values have the same power to separate communities that whiteness and nonwhiteness do" (2016: 63). This implies that ideological division creates the same social, cultural and individual barriers as racial segregation. It also implies that although the novel presents this type of division as an apparent choice, it is nevertheless a governmental control mechanism. Because the intention behind the novel's faction system is to unite citizens with common ideologies, Roszak's observation highlights an oppositional view that the system is, in fact, a divisional force. This interplay of oppositional views, in turn, highlights the oppositional forces at play when utopian and dystopian themes are juxtaposed in a poststructuralist reading of this trilogy.

Jonathan Alexander and Rebecca Black (2015) investigated representations of educational testing in young adult dystopian fiction. They maintain that the high-stakes testing presented in these dystopias is indicative of "the contemporary cultural value placed on testing" (2015: 209). As testing is a form of examination, their observations regarding the role of testing in *Divergent* is particularly useful to this study, particularly since examination is one of the principal elements of Foucault's carceral city.

Alexander and Black claim that novels such as *Divergent* show that the types of learning that takes place before testing, as well as the challenges of the tests themselves are “all aimed at constructing and winnowing out certain types of knowledge and people” (2015: 212). This confirms that certain types of testing will cultivate certain types of people who will end up being representative of cultural and social values that are deemed desirable in certain ideologies. As a result, the examination process will produce identities that can be sorted into groups where they will be most useful to society. This production of identities is indicative of the process involved in creating “docile bodies” (1977: 135), another key Foucauldian concept that is clarified in this dissertation.

Before the key Foucauldian concepts can be discussed and clarified, however, the theoretical framework of poststructuralist theory that is used as methodology in this study should be granted attention. French poststructuralist philosophers Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault are two of the main contributors to poststructuralism and their views on discourse are of fundamental importance. Foucault states that “each society has its régime of truth ... the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true” (1980: 131). This suggests that because discourse generates knowledge and truth, specific discourses in particular contexts have the power to influence individuals in accepting statements as true. Likewise, Derrida believes “the entire history of the concept of structure ... must be thought of as ... a linked chain of determinations of the center” (1978: 279). However, Derrida and other poststructuralist thinkers believe that there is no centre, but rather a “nonlocus in which an infinite number of sign-substitutions came into play” (1978: 280). In the absence of a centre, everything becomes discourse, which is “a system in which the central signified ... is never absolutely present outside a system of differences” (1978: 280).

Peck and Coyle argue that “the terms deconstruction and post-structuralism are sometimes used interchangeably” (1993: 195). As a theory, post-structuralism emerged as a reaction against structuralism’s structured notions of ‘totality’, language and its role in human experience. Structuralism considers everything as a construct or ordering system, thus structuralist critics claim that literary texts fail to give order to the world and are therefore inadequate means of making sense of human experience. In response to this thinking, post-structuralist theorists acknowledge the intangible nature and unreliability of all readings of texts. Every system of communication, including writing, speech and, therefore, literature itself, comprising language created and used by unstable humans, is just as unstable, and therefore ‘undecidable’ (Derrida

1998: xlix). No concept is outside this precariousness of language, making the possible interpretation of meanings of any text infinite, as language itself is the one grounding yet dynamic principle in which our understanding of existence may be located. As language is dynamic and unstable, meaning is not definite, but constantly shifting and propagating various conceivable meanings.

Post-structuralist theorist Michel Foucault's primary focus is in the genealogy of particular discourses "as they relate to specific fields of 'governmentality'" (Tormey 2012: 50). Whisnant argues that discourse is suitable for "analyzing struggles over meaning and other power conflicts, since Foucault and the other post-structuralists always assumed that any given society would be infused with many competing discourses" (2012: 4). Furthermore, since discourse does not focus specifically on power struggles between classes and gender or between the state and its subjects, it has an advantage over traditional ideological approaches. Rather, it suggests "that power is diffuse, and power conflicts can happen at many different sites and levels" (Whisnant 2012: 4). It is therefore appropriate to use discourse theory as part of this dissertation's methodology as discourse "assumes that ideas structure social spaces, and therefore ideas can play a significant role in historical change" (Whisnant 2012:4). This suggests that since dystopian texts function as mechanisms for social criticism, the ideas presented in them continue to play an important role in understanding the social evolution of humanity.

Although the term discourse is widely used, it is often used to indicate different things, depending on the field of study. Initially and most commonly, discourse as a term has been used to define conversation, discussion or a narrative. In linguistics, however, discourse refers to segments of text longer than a sentence. In social theory, discourse can classify various concepts within other theories such as Marxist ideology, studies of subjectivity and the philosophy of knowledge. To post-structuralists, discourse theory highlights how ideas are expressed in language and shows that ideas can actually produce historical transformation. This theory suggests that language can be divided into bodies of statements and utterances – discursive constructions – that are dominated by rules and conventions, of which the user is mostly unaware. Peck & Coyle maintain that discourse is related to "concrete examples of language being used in specific areas of knowledge" (1993: 142). In other words, differences in language usage portray how human behaviour is shaped by a particular vocabulary and knowledge in particular historical periods.

Sonderling argues that *textuality* and *discursivity* are the two theoretical uses of the term discourse that are applied within post-structuralism (1994: 33). In the textuality approach to discourse, Derrida's approach and discussed in more detail later, texts are studied in their own terms as texts and not as an expression of reality or as referring to historical or social context. Here, discourse analysis employs methods of structural analysis that resemble traditional linguistic analyses that consider semiotic systems outside any social contexts. The meaning of texts can be found behind or within the texts and the social and political conditions of the formation and use of language are disregarded. The discursive approach to discourse, on the other hand, considers language as a social practice that emphasises the interaction between the reader and the text in order to produce meaning. It is the "pragmatic aspect of symbol arrangement" (Sonderling 1994: 36) in which language and its social context are of significant interest. A discursive practice is thus the use of language that is dependent on both linguistic and extra-linguistic factors and "implies a whole set of social relations of power that legitimate it" (Sonderling 1994: 39). Discourse, then, plays an important role in the social construction of reality because it is conceptualised through chains of language that express how social worlds are constructed through the complex interaction of different human experiences.

The study of discourse particularly associated with the work of Foucault is chiefly the study of discourse related to discipline, power and hegemony. Foucault views discourse, as set out in *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (1972), as a system in which certain knowledge is conceivable as it determines what is true or not in specific fields. Knowledge does not exist independently of language and is not simply communicated through language. Instead, knowledge is "organized through the structures, interconnections, and associations that are built into language" (Whisnant 2012: 6). Truth, on the other hand, can be generated by discourse because particular discourses in specific contexts have the power to present statements as accepted truths. In addition, not only is knowledge about the intended meaning of statements communicated through discourse, but also about the person who uses the discourse as the discourse itself can reveal the user's gender, social status, sexuality and even his/her relationship to others. This means that discourse reveals a user's authority to apply certain discourses to certain fields, thereby granting a doctor, for example, power over his patients merely through his right to use medical discourse.

Developed under structuralist influences, Foucault's notion of discourse claims that a statement is a repeated kind of act that relates subjects and objects and can be distinguished by seeking out regularities in discourse across various powerful institutions. Foucault states that

whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say ... that we are dealing with a discursive formation (1972: 38).

Discursive formations are "linked and hierarchized transformations" that "describe the relations between statements" (1972: 37). They are thus a series of statements, or a "system of dispersion" (1972: 37) that contains similarities. The focus here lies in the rules that allow for the formation of a statement, including the act of making statements, their contexts and the status of the individual making these statements. Within this network of discursive rules, it is then possible to establish the conditions under which a statement can be considered true or false. Western culture's understanding of a discursive construct such as madness, for example, has changed profoundly over the centuries as its connection to the scientific and medical fields has evolved (Paz 2013: 193). The rules of enunciation of the discursive formations on madness have consequently been modified by changing patterns in the production and consumption of the discourse associated with madness.

It is important to stress that discourse is a social practice in which not only semantic meaning is created, but also socially relevant and appropriate statements are made and used. In order to clarify this further, Foucault studied the history of language and the way in which language is located in relation to what is discernible at different periods in history. Discourse analysis for Foucault is a historically specific way in which human sciences relate to reality. He introduced what he refers to as 'archaeology' as a notion that portrays discourses as modes of knowledge that are historically determined and archived in a form of established rationality. Archaeology can be understood as knowledge about the history of numerous structures of knowledge and the limits and potential that exist for generating knowledge and ideas. Complementary to Derrida's deconstructive approach, archaeology rejects the notion that linguistic practices are made intelligible by background processes and beliefs, and therefore focuses only on what is said rather than why the statement is given. In doing so, archaeological analysis can uncover the unconscious laws that prevail in social practices and which make specific forms of knowledge possible. The validity of a particular discourse within a particular order of knowledge is determined by rules of formation that are governed by such unconscious laws.

The archive, on the other hand, is an outline for how ideas are formed and maintained and for how knowledge is accepted as truth. It defines the space and system in which statements function and is a means of organising knowledge according to formal structures. The archive also establishes how some discourses maintain or lose their expressive power in such a way that it becomes possible for a discourse to cease being meaningful once a system is changed, thus losing its functionality. When an archive is examined, the types of discursive practices that appear, the prevailing relationships between different discursive practices, the relationships between discursive and non-discursive practices and the transformations that these practices advocate, are established.

Discourses are also primarily reinforced by institutions; in conjunction with various mechanisms, such as discipline and power, discourses signify a historically established logic. Institutionalised discourses of politics, science, medicine, religion, economics and literature contain discursive formations that are characterised by coherent unity, consistency and regulation of their statements. Because there is an interrelationship between discourse and societal structure, in order to understand this discourse, signification needs to be located within the context of a theory of power, as power is an essential aspect of social science. Discourse is therefore closely involved in networks of power that are socially reliant because individuals in positions of power have power over the discourse that pervades all aspects that organise and influence how the world is interpreted by others.

Foucault's use of the term discourse is critical to this study's focus on dystopian texts because the utopian/dystopian genre depends on existing examples of language that is used in the areas of knowledge that particularly pertain to this genre. Social conformity, the focus of this study, is a discursive construct of the dystopian text. The vocabulary and knowledge contained within the text itself is a means of providing an understanding of how conformity shapes not only the reality of that particular dystopian setting, but also the behaviour of its characters. The text's discourse is therefore a means of classifying and ordering, and its language "operates in the interests of the institutions of society to construct people in certain ways" (Peck & Coyle 1993:142). In other words, by considering the discourse of dystopian texts, readers who are not part of that fictional world can form an understanding of how its social and political systems operate. In addition, the discourse of the text encapsulates and exposes the characters' entire frame of reference, so that, for example, when a character who has never seen an aeroplane

describes it as a “metal bird”, the reader will be fully aware that an aeroplane is a concept excluded from that character’s discourse; this contributes to the reader’s understanding of that character’s unfamiliarity of this concept.

Applying Foucauldian post-structuralist methods will require the recording of connections that are similar in concept and methodology in order to determine the creation and use of the discourse. Because post-structuralism maintains that there is no centre to our understanding of existence, readers can use the discourse of a text to infer its meaning. This study will view the texts primarily from the perspective of Foucault’s view of discourse as a function of institutional power. Trussel contends that power has typically been viewed in terms of what Foucault calls “the repressive hypothesis”, which regards power as “a centralized force capable of stifling any and all opposition” (Trussel 2009: 97). Power is maintained when truth is suppressed by the dominating force, the sovereign, in whom all power relations are situated and who constitutes absolute observable domination. With the emergence during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of various institutions that employed disciplinary power to manage individuals, power mechanisms shifted systematically from the monarch to society. Such societal power mechanisms focused on developing techniques that produced certain types of subjects – individuals who could be disciplined into subservience. Thus, a contrast emerged between sovereign power and disciplinary power where, in short, disciplinary power could be seen as a more productive power than the sovereign’s asymmetric power of giving and taking.

The modern discourse of power, discipline and punishment can be viewed from the perspective of Foucault’s study of prisons as set out in *Discipline and Punish*, in which he introduces the idea of the carceral, an influential idea in twentieth century dystopias and the central concept in this dissertation. In order to effectively apply Foucault’s theories as methodology in this dissertation, it is firstly important to understand how institutions of power such as the prison came about and what the incarceration system and its various carceral mechanisms reveal about how power operates in a society.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault provides theoretical foundation for and explanation of the conditions and systems of operational power in society that he studied and documented, particularly the French penal system. This work documents “the historical shift of carceral institutions and punishment practices from mid eighteenth to mid nineteenth century” (Lane 1977: 269). It opens with a horrific account of the public execution of Robert-François Damiens

and then juxtaposes this account with the daily timetable of a prisoner 80 years later. In doing so, Foucault reveals that the “economy of punishment” has undergone a “great institutional transformation”, one in which “torture as a public spectacle” and punishment of a criminal’s physical body have been eradicated as practices (1977: 7). Throughout Foucault’s work, he considers the body of the condemned as the subject of “political technology” (1977: 24), an object that the sovereign can exert his will upon through physically harmful disciplinary measures. When punishment shifted from harming the physical body directly to reforming what Foucault terms as the soul, physical punishment shifted to mental reform. By placing the body in “an economy of suspended rights” (1977:11), the severity of punishment for serious transgressions diminished drastically. As the archetypal mechanics of punishment changed its procedures, so punishment changed from a harmful practice to a reforming one, thus encouraging the birth of the prison system.

In this system, it is not just the transgressor’s body that is punished, but more specifically, the offences themselves are punished, as “judgement is also passed on the passions, instincts, anomalies, infirmities, maladjustments, effects of environment or heredity; acts of aggression are punished, so also ... aggressivity” (Foucault 1977: 17). Therefore, the body is transformed into an instrument of punishment that, ultimately, has a complicated social function that serves as a positive preventative measure in society. Moreover, the body is a political instrument too as “power relations have an immediate hold upon it” (Foucault 1977: 25); it can be moulded, regulated and supervised into an obedient individual. Finally, Foucault argues that the shift from torture to incarceration as a system of punishment had drastic consequences for societal structure itself, as punitive practices ultimately pervaded society outside the prison walls.

In the eighteenth century, the structures of power were reorganised to modify criminal law in response to the rise of crimes against property in capitalist society, where land was not owned only by the monarch, but also by citizens who wanted their property protected against “criminality of fraud” (Foucault 1977: 77). Foucault observes that an effort was made “to adjust the mechanisms of power that frame everyday lives of individuals; an adaptation and a refinement of the machinery that assumes responsibility for and places under surveillance their everyday behaviour” (1977: 77). The system of punishment therefore had to change from punishing offences against the monarch, to safeguarding a well-behaved society instead.

Thus, “a calculated economy of the art of punishment” (Lane 1977: 271) developed, one in which the means of punishment became more humanised and restrained and in which the severity of the punishment was adapted to suit the severity of the crime. Humane punishment entailed establishing certain rules that would mandate leniency and which were not implemented for the sake of preserving the criminal’s humanity. Rather, such rules were a means to regulate power relations so that the immensity of the power to penalise, which was once solely in the hands of the sovereign’s, would remain tempered, lest it became dangerous. New principles were therefore systematically developed over time, “regularizing, refining, universalizing the art of punishing” (Foucault 1977: 89) in order to develop societal norms that would contribute to defending society and averting criminality, instead of simply taking revenge. Punishment was intended to discourage criminal behaviour in order to produce a filtering effect on society as a whole, and not just on the transgressor. Consequently, the penal system now required evidence that demonstrated and verified the perpetration and specificities of crimes.

The prison system became an institution that could accomplish what torture could not because it surfaced at a time when property and personal liberty were valued most, and prison punished by depriving an individual of both. This form of punishment created consequences for crime, which in turn, discouraged recurrence. Thus, it was important to establish a fear of punishment in order to diminish the desire to commit crime. In order to accomplish the parameters against which a transgression’s severity, and thus its accompanying punishment could be judged, a code of laws that stipulated the norms of public morality had to be established and enforced. Imprisonment became a corrective as well as a reformative method of punishment that would ensure that an individual would be redesigned as a subject of law by means of coercive mechanisms, a technology of power, embedded in the penal system of the prison. Relevant here is the correctional institution’s goal of transforming an individual’s ‘soul’ into an obedient subject by means of introducing newly formed habits, ones that will be established through training new behavioural patterns. Foucault argues that this can only be accomplished if the power to which the individual is subjected remains autonomous. This type of power has become a primary mechanism of modern institutions of incarceration.

This brings to the fore the first of the key theoretical points essential to this study: what Foucault terms ‘discipline’, a form of power that controls and coerces the body through regulatory systems that restrict the body’s movements and operations in such a way that

individuals are disciplined into adopting desirable behaviour. This type of discipline can be traced back to the practices put in place by monasteries and armies that have spread over time to encompass the disciplinary practices of factories, schools, hospitals and, indeed, entire populations.

Foucault presents the soldier's routine as a representative model for the concept of discipline: he is trained and monitored to follow a rigorous timetable and a rigorous training regimen designed to programme his body to become the required machine. The soldier is recognisable in the signs he bears: his movement, his mannerisms and his deliberate self-possession all display "a bodily rhetoric of honour" (Foucault 1977: 135). This "automatism of habit" is formed by specific modes of training, thus making a soldier "something that can be made", a constructed machine (Foucault 1977: 135).

Disciplinary institutions emphasise self-control and obedience to rules and, in doing so, act like machines with transformative and controlling power. This is because the classical era "discovered the body as the object and target of power" (Foucault 1977: 136). "Projects of docility" (1977: 136) emerged, in which methods of constant, uninterrupted and subtle coercion could be exerted on the body. This made control of all functions of the body possible and imposed upon it a docility-utility relation that Foucault terms "disciplines". Although these disciplines have always existed, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they became a universal principle of domination. For Foucault, "Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience)" (1977:138). Discipline, therefore, is a common practice of the modern state to exert mass control and it consists of various micro-mechanisms that subtly impose uniform behaviour on citizens.

This brings one to Foucault's second key concept, that of "docile bodies" (1977: 135). Foucault states that "disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and an increased domination" (1977: 138). This means that docility is achieved by means of employing specific disciplinary methods. These methods differ from forceful and violent intimidation, as discipline controls the operations and positions of the body. Various other institutions function like the soldier's barracks, such as the assembly line in which the role of the factory worker is dictated by a particular schedule; or in schools, where children are regulated according to grades that follow scheduled timetables. Indeed, Foucault

believes that disciplinary coercion may envelop a very large part of the entire social body. In each case, the needs of the institution determine the mechanisms used to manipulate and control bodies at the desired level of docility.

The dystopian worlds of the three primary texts selected for this study can be seen as representative models for such institutions. *Brave New World*'s society mimics that of a factory assembly line, *Shades of Grey* that of a school and *Divergent*'s main setting, the Dauntless compound, mimics that of a military barracks. In fact, the extent to which each novel represents the institutional practices on which its society is based is so apparent that this makes it possible to gain valuable insight into how such institutions employ their disciplinary methods to achieve optimal conforming behaviour.

Foucault argues that disciplinary methods can only be sustained under certain conditions and when particular techniques are employed. Disciplinary conditions are suitable if the institution, whether monastery, hospital, factory, barracks or school, has an enclosed space that acts as a protected place with specific rules. This larger space should then be partitioned into smaller spaces – like cells in a series – in which every individual has his/her own space. Such would be the case in the hospital where each patient has his/her own bed, or in the classroom where each pupil has his/her own desk. Each of these partitioned spaces is a “functional site” (Foucault 1977: 143) that is intended to accomplish a particular goal and make supervision and control unproblematic. In a functional site, communication between individuals is prohibited in order to maximise the individual's usefulness and contribution to the communal goal. Finally, institutions like these employ a hierarchical system that classifies individuals in a particular category – a rank – so that the institution can function optimally. By ranking individuals according to the needs of the institution, in different grades at schools, various official positions in the army, the institution “individualizes bodies by a location that does not give them a fixed position, but distributes them and circulates them in a network of relations” (Foucault 1977: 146). This implies that while the real space, such as a desk in a classroom, dictates where an individual should be, the “rank” dictates to the individual what he/she is supposed to do while occupying the physical space.

Once the spaces within the institution have been distributed effectively, controlling the activities of individuals in the institution is essential, as regulated time and space has a direct effect on the actions and thoughts of individuals. Because time and space form the most basic

elements of human life, control of activities is accomplished by partitioning time, establishing routines and allocating occupations according to timetables – the general structure for an activity. Like space, time is divided so that the way in which individuals experience time is regulated. The activity is then sub-divided into its elements, where “to each movement are assigned a direction, an aptitude, a duration” (Foucault 1977: 152). Furthermore, disciplinary control not only imposes the adoption of certain movements, but also achieves efficiency and speed by dictating the best relation between a gesture and the general demeanour of the body. The body is then programmed to manipulate objects in a disciplined way and will continue to do so until the point of exhaustion as a body cannot be conditioned into docility if that body is wasting time through idleness.

The chapters that follow will therefore investigate the disciplinary techniques that societies in the primary texts employ in order to programme the bodies of their citizens into docile bodies that conform to the social norms of that world. Disciplinary power of this nature can only be accomplished by training bodies according to the needs of the institution on which a society’s social structures are based.

The first method of training the body into docility involves what Foucault terms “hierarchical observation”. This disciplinary mechanism coerces the body by means of constant surveillance. Foucault argues that “the techniques that make it possible to see induce effects of power” (1977: 171). In the military camp, for example, close observation forms part of the overall operation of power, as every part of the camp is visible. Perhaps more interestingly is Foucault’s indication that the underlying principle of the military camp has been employed as model for the construction of urban residential areas, hospitals, asylums, prisons and schools. Each of these institutions has come to incorporate “the spatial ‘nesting’ of hierarchized surveillance” (1977: 171) that accomplishes perpetual objectification through “subtle partitioning of individual behaviour” (1977: 173). Foucault claims that one of the reasons that circular architecture, for example, was popular in the second half of the eighteenth century was that buildings arranged in a circle, with a tall construction in the centre that functioned as the management focal point, “expressed a certain political utopia” (1977: 174).

What makes hierarchical observational practices such an effective disciplinary tool is that, as in the case of the Panopticon, discussed below, observation disciplines individuals to practise self-policing, thereby producing docile behaviour with the least effort. It facilitates “an internal,

articulated and detailed control” (Foucault 1977: 172) in which an individual learns what role he/she is expected to play within in institution and in turn, allows the individual to adapt to the roles played by others. This makes surveillance a disciplinary power that is “organized as a multiple, automatic and anonymous power” (Foucault 1977: 176) that functions like machinery – a network of relations that keeps “the whole together and traverses it in its entirety with effects of power” (Foucault 1977: 177). This implies that discipline itself is a power relation that has imbedded mechanisms of self-sustainability, making it both transparent, as it is everywhere and always attentive, and subtle, as it functions perpetually and in silence.

In order to conform to the dictated institutional roles, individuals must be trained to internalise the norms and expectations of that institution. Foucault’s notion of “normalising judgment” involves the idea of societal organisation by means of established norms as an alternative to physical punishment. Individuals are ranked against an established norm, which is the measurement of the behaviour or operation of individuals. Foucault calls the norm one of the “great instruments of power” (Foucault 1977: 184) as it imposes homogeneity while differentiating between individuals. Conforming to the same set of standards becomes compulsory practice because at the core of disciplinary mechanisms is a small penal mechanism in which the smallest infraction from correct behaviour is punished. Lane argues that “[c]onformity and non-conformity to pre-established norms are without doubt traced in this disciplinary system” (1977: 275). Subtle disciplinary procedures such as light physical punishment or minor humiliations give a punitive function to the seemingly routine elements of the disciplinary system. Obtained directly from the mechanics of training, the purpose is for the punishment to have a corrective effect on the individual so that non-conforming behaviour will be corrected and not repeated.

The final step in correct training is to make it possible to regulate, classify and punish individuals by combining techniques of hierarchical observation and normalising judgement in “the examination” as an effective means of subjugation. It not only tests, but also documents details (as in the case of a medical examination) that reveal the examined individual’s entire existence. Thus, the examined individual is disciplined and studied at the same time, making that individual’s body, in turn, a source of knowledge that will be used to discipline another body. The examination therefore provides the foundation for establishing social practices against which the individuals’ results can be measured and actions can be controlled.

Disciplining individuals into becoming docile bodies is the primary function of the panoptic system. Jeremy Bentham's nineteenth-century panopticon – pan meaning all and optics referring to sight – inspired Foucault's representative model for nineteenth-century societal mechanisms. For Foucault, the investigation of this type of prison system was a means of examining how dominance and social construction are accomplished in the modern world. In the panopticon, a building with a tower at the centre, a prisoner in any cell could be seen at any time by the guards in the tower. This architectural design prevented the prisoner from knowing whether he was actually being watched or not. The result was that prisoners constantly modified their behaviour out of the belief that they were under constant surveillance. Visibility became a regulatory means of preventing crowding and minimising the chances of revolt. The panoptic system thus exerted pressure on individuals, forcing them to behave correctly as established by the norms of the institution.

In dystopian settings, the panoptic design is almost always present in one form or another, whether through police surveillance, camera surveillance, peer surveillance or simply constant visibility effected through architectural design. Apart from the settings of the primary texts in this dissertation, an apt example here is Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, the first of the three founding dystopias mentioned earlier, in which citizens each have a glass room of their own, which ensures that they are observable at all times. The shades may only be pulled at state-approved times when citizens are allowed privacy with guests. In fact, all the buildings of the society of One State are made of glass, including its bridges and upper floor walkways. Together with other carceral mechanisms such as strict schedules and dictated uniform behaviour, constant visibility contributes to the disciplinary mechanisms that keep the citizens of Zamyatin's One State docile.

The overwhelming presence of surveillance and censorship enforces behavioural restrictions to such an extreme degree that the disciplinary mechanisms and the surveillance of others, and one's self, become a new internalised 'normal'. This type of monitoring and disciplinary system achieves a means of meticulous behavioural coercion that in essence subjugates individuals into subservience, thereby nullifying the need for aggressive force. To add to this, the panopticon emphasises the notion of efficiency in the sense that it can increase the number of observed individuals while at the same time diminishing the number of overseers necessary. Moreover, continuous observation allows for the accumulation and centralisation of extensive

knowledge and information on the prisoners, which may prove valuable as a source of information, contributing to the development of improved methods of reform and coercion.

The pivotal point that Foucault highlights is that although the panopticon is a prison design, it is essentially a metaphorical model for examining a disciplined society. Such a disciplined community was created in the seventeenth century as a response to the outbreak of the plague: spaces were partitioned, houses were closed off and constant inspections and registrations were enforced. The need for surveillance emerged as part of anti-plague measures in order to protect society. When considered in the context of dystopian discourse, the outbreak of a massive disaster such as the plague can be seen as representative of an extraordinary evil, such as a world-ending disaster, in which power is mobilised to drive the novels' societies to seek out and establish alternative modes of societal design. The panopticon, therefore, serves as a metaphorical model of a disciplined society with power relations that influence all human operations in all aspects of society. In this model, observation occurs outside enclosed institutions such as prisons because social norms are pervasive. This proves how powerful disciplinary power is as it is unconsciously internalized and need not be violently enforced.

In essence, the mechanisms of the penal justice system of imprisonment as penalty for deviation from accepted societal norms embody the discourse of discipline and power present in dystopian settings. Since its inception, prison has become so tangible that substituting it with another system seems unthinkable because, as Foucault argues, prison is so closely connected to the functioning of society. In theory, the discourse of punishment is centred on imprisonment because, to this day, humanity has not found an alternative means of punishment. As most societies are built on the concept of liberty, the prison's role in depriving individuals of liberty as well as its aim to transform individuals by correcting undesirable behaviour has a direct impact on all mechanisms found in the entire social body.

In order to act both as freedom-depriving detention centre and as behaviour-altering reformation centre, the prison has become the penitentiary, an institution in which the prisoner is isolated and constantly observed; his behaviour is documented and regulated in time and space; his mental state is evaluated and his abnormality is catalogued. The penitentiary operates on a moral, economic and medical level. On the moral level, the seriousness of the crime will determine how the criminal is isolated and placed in a hierarchy of moral decadence. On the economic level, the prisoner can benefit society by being trained to be productive once he

returns to society. On the medical level, the penitentiary attempts to ‘cure’ the criminal’s delinquency by realigning him with the social norms that will facilitate his functioning in society.

The penitentiary no longer defines the subject locked in the prison as an ‘offender’, but as a ‘delinquent’. An offender’s punishment corresponds with his action – his offence is against the law. A delinquent, on the other hand, is an individual who displays abnormal behavioural patterns and thoughts and whose personality itself is the offence. Delinquency is defined in terms of norms, not laws, and the delinquent is an individual who commits an offence against the norms. He is set apart from the rest of society as ‘the other’ and is, in fact, a creation of the operation of the penitentiary. The penitentiary is thus concerned with the life of the criminal and not just his transgressions because, as an institution with the purpose of normalising, great attention is paid to whatever falls outside the norm.

Foucault reflects that although prisons rarely reform delinquents completely, the problem lies not with the notion of the prison system itself but in the fact that the ideal form of the prison has not yet been established. Until such an ideal can be realised, the penal system functions to reinforce social norms by “placing over the slightest illegality, the smallest irregularity, deviation or anomaly, the threat of delinquency” (Foucault 1977: 297). Thus, if society is governed by norms more than by laws, members of society will police themselves into correct behaviour in order to avoid the threat of delinquency. Otherness can be abolished because society can be conditioned to think, act and be the same.

In the development of civilisation, as new forms of knowledge such as psychological science came about, and because such a science promised a cure that would transform the entire life of an individual, someone who needed to be cured also needed to be produced. Foucault argues that the existence of delinquency in itself proves that a prison system fails as cure to reform problematic behaviour within a society. Penal justice does not reduce crime rates, detention causes reoffending, the constraints and environment of the prison itself produce and condition delinquents and encourage delinquents to plot further crimes. Furthermore, prison impoverishes the prisoner’s family, thereby producing further delinquency. In response to the critique of the prison, Foucault argues that the prison should be viewed as a means to distinguish offences, not as a means of eliminating them. If so, then prison succeeds in creating a form of illegality, a term that names a series of common behaviours that fall outside lawful

conduct. Delinquency is a politically and economically less dangerous form of illegality and one which can be separated from other offences; it is possible to identify, monitor, study and control delinquency as such individuals form only a small group in society.

The concept of delinquency is essential to understanding dystopian discourse, as the protagonist of a dystopian novel is in most cases a delinquent who displays ‘abnormal’ behaviour as he/she fails to be disciplined by the established norms of that particular society. In the chapters that follow, this dissertation will examine the level of delinquency of characters who deviate from society’s supposed utopian norms, thereby highlighting the difference between utopian ideology and dystopian speculation.

In order to prove his theory that the mechanisms of the prison system have been integrated into society and that panopticism is not unique to prisons but pervasive throughout Western societies, Foucault starts by mentioning that the decisive moment in the development of the carceral system was the day on which the Mettray prison colony was opened in France in 1840. Foucault regards this penal colony as “the disciplinary form at its most extreme, the model in which are concentrated all the coercive technologies of behaviour” (1977: 293). The Mettray prison colony, the most famous of a range of carceral institutions, was a dystopian world that employed a supervision system akin to that of authoritarian governments portrayed in dystopian science fiction novels. It involved creating a “carceral continuum” (Foucault 1977: 297) that included confinement, judicial punishment and institutions of discipline. In this continuum, various levels of severity were arranged, classified or ranked as determined by the observational process.

The Mettray prison colony contains the mechanisms of the carceral city, the modern system of punishment, one in which the prison, penitentiary and carceral system are in place and functioning optimally. Because prison is closely related to the rest of society by a network of life-shaping power relations, the carceral system aims to reorganise knowledge about crime and delinquency, not particularly to eliminate it. The system embraces the discipline of the prison, collective objectivity, the reintroduction of delinquency and the reiteration of reform. As disciplinary mechanism, the carceral city “lays down for each individual his place, his body, ... his well-being, by means of an omnipresent and omniscient power that subdivides itself in a regular, uninterrupted way ... , of what characterizes him, of what belongs to him, of what happens to him” (Foucault 1977: 197).

Using the term “carceral archipelago”, Foucault maintains that the mechanisms of control contained within the carceral system have expanded beyond the prison walls and into the Western world. Because the carceral mechanisms that control the prisoner’s life also control the lives of citizens, he argues that the penal system therefore also affects society in its entirety as the “carceral network reaches all the disciplinary mechanisms that function throughout society” (1977: 298).

Foucault argues that “[t]he carceral network, in its compact or disseminated forms, with its systems of insertion, distribution, surveillance, observation, has been the greatest support, in modern society, of the normalizing power” (1977: 304). Therefore, the social mechanisms that are in place within each of the selected novels and the level at which these mechanisms achieve compliance can be deconstructed and contextualised through Foucauldian discourse theory. It is my argument that if Foucault’s carceral system guarantees submission, then by logical inference it will also guarantee conformity, as conformity is in itself submission to socially accepted conventions that comply with standards, rules and laws. A conforming society is thus a disciplined society. Foucault’s findings on the mechanics of incarceration therefore not only provide a foundation for equating a dystopian world to a prison, but more importantly provide insight into the resulting social mechanics that will inevitably arise within the confines of such an enclosed system. His concept of ‘the carceral’ is useful in terms of real-world conditions and the resulting effect of disciplining citizens into submitting to the systems established by the ruling class.

Applying Foucault’s theories of the power of normalisation in a society to a dystopian world will account for the society’s success in pacifying citizens by means of social systems. As each society in the novels discussed here has a differently established social system dictated by its government – its own ‘normal’ based on its own ideology – the power of the dystopian authority is effective and accepted because it is a power that functions not “by right, but by technique, not by law, but by normalization, not by punishment, but by control” (Foucault in Mambrol 2017).

While Foucault’s focus is on the genealogy of particular discourses, Jacques Derrida’s primary focus is on textual analysis in the philosophical and literary canon. At the heart of deconstruction as critical theory is Derrida’s notion of the metaphysics of presence and

différance. For Derrida, "There is nothing outside of the text" (1976: 158) and "our reading must be intrinsic and remain within the text" (1976: 159). His deconstructive theory emerged as an attack on what he calls "logocentrism", and although Derrida is not fond of providing clear definitions, on this concept he is explicit: it is the "metaphysics of phonetic writing (for example, of the alphabet) which was fundamentally ... nothing but the most original and powerful ethnocentrism, in the process of imposing itself upon the world, controlling in one and the same order"(1976: 3). Furthermore, he states that "logocentrism would thus support the determination of the being of the entity as presence" (1976: 12). What this implies is that Western philosophy placed at the centre of its understanding of existence a concept – the logos – that acts as a grounding principle by which to manage and elucidate the world while it remains outside the world. Logocentrism generates and is dependent upon binary oppositions, a structuralist idea for the conceptualisation of human experience, in which one of the members of the opposition is privileged. According to this way of thinking, once the privileged term is discovered, the ideology that the text endorses, and therefore its true meaning, can be determined.

Derrida, however, argues that existence has no centre and humans are unstable beings with "ambiguous force-fields of competing ideologies" (Tyson 1999: 250). He believes that meaning can only be determined when readers can distinguish the differences between words or things. He coined the term *différance*, an important post-structuralist concept, observing that "[w]e shall designate by the term *différance* the movement by which any language, or any code, any system of reference in general, becomes 'historically' constituted as a fabric of differences" (Derrida in Bradley 2008: 70). For Derrida, *différance* is a label for "the only 'meaning' that language can have" (Tyson 1999: 246). Language is therefore "a play of differences ... and displacements of meaning" (Castle 2007: 156).

While Derrida's method of a deconstructive reading acknowledges how order is accomplished in a text by a writer, it also indicates the contradictions and complications arising in the text as a result of the mechanisms imposed by the writer's ideologically saturated ordering strategies. Derrida views the standard ordering of thoughts into binary pairs, so popular in western culture, as inadequate, while at the same time acknowledging that, in order to create coherent arguments during a deconstructive reading, "a similar dependency upon binary pairs" (Peck & Coyle 1993: 195) inevitably occurs. Ultimately then, by uncovering the binary oppositions operating

in a text and ascertaining the privileged member of the pair, the ideology promoted by that text can be discovered.

Derrida believes that a deconstructive reading is both “a faithful attempt to follow the dominant interpretation of the text, its assumptions, concepts and arguments” as well as one that traces “its excluded, repressed and inferior interpretation that forms an undercurrent in the text” (Rasiński 2011: 11). Although the dominant interpretation is reliant on what it dismisses, thus determining a textual hierarchy, privileging either the suppressed or the dominant interpretation is not deconstruction’s aim. Rather, by claiming that one binary member is privileged yet not one interpretation can claim to be dominant, it aims to account for the undecidability of the text as an “endless displacement of meaning which both governs language and places it forever beyond the reach of a stable, self-authenticating knowledge” (Norris 1982: 29). Thus Derrida maintains that “undecidability is always a determinate oscillation between possibilities ... These possibilities are themselves highly determined in strictly defined situations ... They are pragmatically determined” (Derrida in Rasiński 2011: 12).

Deconstructive criticism’s emphasis on the contradictions over which the writer has no control is what makes it a suitable choice as part of the methodology for this dissertation. Because deconstruction provides a sceptical view from which to analyse the ways in which Western society is structured, it is a useful tool for analysis, particularly in the dystopian literary field. It reveals “the ways in which our experience is determined by ideologies of which we are unaware because they are ‘built into’ our language” (Tyson 1999: 241). It is the emphasis of post-structuralist critics like Derrida on “the fragility of the ideological order of society rather than the strength or coherence of any period” (Peck & Coyle 1993: 199) that justifies the use of this theory as an analytical method for this study. Using deconstruction as a method of reading dystopian texts in particular will be a means of revealing the texts’ undecidability as well as exposing the complex operations of these texts’ ideological frameworks. In other words, by examining the texts’ discourse, the worlds of the novels’ societies, though apparently utopian, cannot in essence be deemed as perfect, or a good place, because their internal mechanisms are in conflict with the ideals that they propound. This conflict occurs because the ideology of the hegemony of the novel’s society and the ideology of the readers’ society are in opposition. Therefore, by deconstructing the mechanisms of the texts’ social practices, these mechanisms can be located in the cultural discourses in which they attain the norm that that society’s ideology dictates.

At this point, it is perhaps fitting to mention that although both Derrida and Foucault's theoretical approaches are applied in this study, and although their strategies differ, the goal of their strategies is similar. As post-structuralists, both thinkers aim "to understand the inherent possibilities of the present and to uncover ways of thinking that are not (yet) part of the present systems of thought" (Trussel 2009: 37). The use of both thinkers' theories is therefore justified as these theories will complement each other throughout the investigation.

The chapters that follow investigate how each novel establishes its world as a successful carceral city that incorporates most, if not all, elements of the incarceration system that Foucault highlights in *Discipline and Punish*. Their societies are located in enclosed and segmented spaces and are always observed or supervised. Individuals are constrained in fixed spaces, either by class or location, events are recorded and power is exercised. The chapters depict readings of the novels in terms of their portrayal of dystopian carceral mechanisms, within the discourse of power and discipline in the dystopian science fiction literary canon in an investigation of the disciplinary mechanisms that establish and maintain social conformity to each society's social and political systems. Each chapter also investigates how delinquency is managed when individuals resist becoming docile bodies by failing to conform to their society's norms. The questions these delinquents' thoughts and behaviour expose concerning the supposed utopian nature of that society are also explored.

CHAPTER 2: ALDOUS HUXLEY'S *BRAVE NEW WORLD*

In post-structuralist thought, a dystopian text is essentially a utopian text that deconstructs itself. Huxley's *Brave New World* is the perfect example of such a text, one in which utopian notions are criticised by the text's own use of utopian elements, thus creating a dystopian carceral city with penitentiary mechanisms that embody the discourse of discipline and power present in most dystopian settings. Huxley's 'civilised' world is a carceral city that "lays down for each individual his place, his body, ... his well-being" (Foucault 1977: 197). This "omnipresent and omniscient power" is a highly stratified and class-orientated social system that functions primarily to discipline citizens through categorisation, thereby achieving pacification through subdivision of hierarchical power relations.

In the carceral of *Brave New World* (henceforth *BNW*), autonomy has been sacrificed for stability and happiness, the ultimate goals of its World State. The opening chapters establish the society of a futuristic London, a seemingly perfect world from which poverty, disease, war and unhappiness have been eradicated. Various blood surrogates and supplements protect citizens from contracting illnesses or showing signs of aging. The concepts of family and marriage have been abolished and procreation has been replaced by genetic engineering. Biological manipulation, indoctrination and the drug *soma* ensure productive and compliant behaviour. The protagonists Bernard Marx and John Savage find themselves at odds with this world. Scepticism about World State's utopian society is introduced initially by Bernard Marx's inability to conform completely to society's 'normal'. He feels like an outsider and, unlike his socially conditioned fellow inhabitants, longs to be less a part of the social body and more an individual. Both Bernard and his friend Helmholtz Watson long for meaningful human experience, something that state-sanctioned conditioning and drug-taking have deprived individuals of. Bernard takes the "pneumatic" (42) Lenina to visit a Savage Reservation, a place that still contains practices 'primitive' forms of religion, procreation and raw human experiences such as aging, hunger and disease. Here they meet John the Savage, the novel's protagonist and one of the carceral's delinquents, who was born naturally in the Reservation when his civilised mother Linda, unwittingly pregnant, was abandoned there. When John and Linda are taken back to London, Bernard's association with the Savage gives him the social acceptance he has longed for as he brings this strange new spectacle as a new form of

amusement to society. The reader's focus then shifts to John's inability to understand and fit in with this society's normal.

Huxley skilfully opens his novel with an adaptation of a common utopian convention by introducing the reader to the features of this society as the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning is giving a tour to a group of students. The Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre is the institution responsible for artificially producing and conditioning the population of the civilised world. Through the Director's discourse, the value that this society places on capitalist ideals and technological advancement becomes apparent. The factory – satirically named the Hatchery – in which this tour takes place, manufactures human beings in test tubes (“bottles”) on an assembly line, each human genetically designed according to the stringent stipulations of the class to which he or she will inevitably belong. Huxley's criticism of consumer capitalism is particularly apparent in this initial part of the novel, as not only are human beings mass produced on an assembly line famously associated with Henry Ford, but Henry Ford himself is literally worshipped by this society. The calendar is dated A.F. (After Ford) and the top of the Christian cross symbol has been cut off to make a ‘T’, to simulate Ford's Model T automobile. In fact, Ford's name is solidified in the discursive formations of the citizens' discourse in statements such as “Oh, Ford!” (24), “His fordship Mustapha Mond” (28) and “Bibles, poetry – Ford knew what” (29).

The Hatchery thus functions as the very first disciplinary agency as it is here, before birth (or, being “decanted”), that the human foetus is either bottled as an upper-class Alpha or Beta, or as a lower-class Gamma, Delta or Epsilon. Once decanted, citizens of each class will wear the designated colour clothing as a type of uniform that communicates to others to which class they belong. The narrator observes:

One egg, one embryo, one adult – normality. But a boganovskified egg will bud, will proliferate, will divide. (3)

Eggs that are predestined to become lower class workers undergo the “Boganovsky Process”, a discursive formation that signifies the stunting process that shocks an egg so that it will be divided into numerous identical embryos that will develop into identical humans. This dividing process weakens the embryos, with the result that Alpha and Beta embryos are developed ‘normally’. Foetuses also receive different treatment depending on their caste. Alphas are

genetically rewarded with high IQs so that they can occupy positions that require advanced intelligence; Deltas and Epsilons' intelligence is stunted by oxygen deprivation and alcohol treatment, while their physical strength and endurance are enhanced. Some fetuses are "heat conditioned" to enjoy working in tropical climates so that, once decanted, "people like their unescapable social destiny" (12). The Director explains:

Bokanovsky's Process is one of the major instruments of social stability! (5)

The Bokanovsky Process as discursive formation validates the privileging of cloning as a mode of existing in this world, and how this world establishes its examination of the subject of social stability. Indeed, identical humans cloned to perform identical tasks at identical machines produce the very lack of individual difference required to build a disciplined homogenous society. It is this carceral's first disciplinary process that restricts the body's movements and operations so that individuals are more easily equipped to become trained to adopt desirable and correct behaviour. As in the parts produced in Ford's factories, people are biologically manufactured to fit perfectly into a predestined place in the social machine of this carceral city.

The carceral mechanism that complements genetically engineered compliant bodies in order to guarantee that complete social conformity is maintained is World State's conditioning programme. In the second chapter, the Director leads the group to "Infant Nurseries. Neo-Pavlovian Conditioning Rooms" (15). Here the reader is made aware of the fact that this carceral city complements biological science with psychological science to complete the 'nature versus nurture' cycle of human development. The Conditioning Centre employs two main carceral mechanisms that are designed to keep citizens content with the roles in which they are placed in society, namely Pavlovian theory and Hypnopaedia. Russian scientist Ivan Pavlov's research that found that dogs would salivate at the ringing of a bell is familiar in Western science. However, World State's Conditioning Centre combines this same conditioning method with Hypnopaedia, which is sleep training. By subjecting infants to electric shocks at particular times and under certain conditions, and by playing certain phrases while these infants are asleep, their behaviour becomes unquestioning and instinctive. They react as "specimens of their class" (Booker 1994: 49) without critical thought and obey and accept the rules and requirements of the caste system involuntarily.

One of the central concerns of dystopian science fiction novels is the dangerous potential of scientific and technological advances. In *BNW*, because science is an instrument of power, it has become a carceral mechanism. Biological science enables the manufacture of the mass-produced workers on which this society relies, and makes possible the custom design of citizens with particularly desirable qualities. Behavioural science enables the development of effective conditioning methods that keep citizens cooperative and docile. Finally, technological science allows the maintenance of a consumer culture through the development of things such as the pacifying drug *soma*, “scent organs” and films known as “feelies” that stimulate multiple senses at the same time. As the “technological capability of the giant government-industrial complex that rules the society functioning as a main symbol of its power” (Booker 1994: 49-50), scientific advancement is a carceral mechanism that aids in disciplining citizens to conform to the established norms. The character Mustapha Mond, one of ten World Controllers who run the World State, explains:

... science is a public danger. As dangerous as it has been beneficent. It has given us the stablest equilibrium in history ... But we can't allow science to undo its own good work. That's why we so carefully limit the scope of its researches... (200)

Mond confirms here that scientific knowledge itself is a power relation. Because Foucault reasons that “power is coextensive with the social body” and is “multiple in form” (Baker 1998: 27), in the context of this society, the dangerous potential of scientific and technological advancement is far-reaching. Mond suggests that although science benefits society by providing comfort and distraction, it is also a useful tool of control and manipulation when it is state regulated. The pursuit of truth through the scientific process can also lead to undesirable subversive knowledge, unwanted in a homogenous society. The author's criticism seems to lie in the fact that although scientific knowledge can be abused and thus lead to overtly destructive discoveries and inventions such as weapons, its potential for abuse as a means of obscured disciplinary practices can be far more malevolent. However, it should also be noted that because Foucault deems knowledge and power as “intimately and productively related” (Baker 1998: 25), Mond's explanation reveals the view that scientific knowledge is regarded as a power relation that should be used productively and not merely repressively. In Mond's society, scientific knowledge has been used to create societal mechanisms that contribute towards maintaining a stable society, free of what are considered negative aspects of humanity, aspects that have proved to be harmful and destructive. The reader is thus encouraged to consider the veracity of Foucault's claim that knowledge and power are intimately related, as this verifies

that as scientific and technological knowledge develops and advances, so will such advances encourage counteractive power relations. In other words, viewing scientific progress as either productive or repressive is not merely a matter of perspective: if it is to be productive, it will most certainly also be repressive in one form or another.

The novel's introduction to the processes involved in creating a conforming society also highlights the opposition between sameness and difference. In the third chapter, Huxley uses a "complex strategy of counterpoint like cinematic montage" (Seed 2010: 482), in which the voices of three different characters, Mustapha Mond, Lenina Crowe and Bernard Marx, run together in different settings one after the other, as if the one is unknowingly completing with each other's thoughts:

"All crosses had their tops cut and became T's. There was also a thing called God."

"It's real morocco-surrogate."

"We have the World State now. And Ford's Day celebrations, and Community Sings, and Solidarity Services."

"Ford, how I hate them!" Bernard Marx was thinking.

"There was a thing called heaven; but all the same they used to drink enormous quantities of alcohol." (45)

This technique effectively dramatises the internal contradictions within 'civilised' society, thereby deconstructing the text itself through the simultaneous speech of three different people. The first and third statements, spoken by Mustapha Mond, suggest that while the concepts of God and religion have been eradicated, this society has merged materialism and spiritualism to create another being to worship – Henry Ford – and other religious practices in which to participate. Thus, while this carceral was intended to eradicate religious devotion to a deity completely, it has merely succeeded in substituting one supreme being for another.

In the second statement, spoken by Lenina Crowne, the character is oblivious of the oxymoron contained in her statement. The very existence of a belt that is made of material that is simultaneously real and fake effectively undermines the contrast between these binaries. Furthermore, while people's reliance on and abuse of alcohol before The Nine Years War is intended to reflect society's inferiority and weakness, the very purpose of the drug *soma* is

ignored. This society is dependent on *soma*, just as contemporary society is dependent on alcohol; the contrast between the two societies is thus undermined, proving that the real social problems leading to drug and alcohol abuse have still not been addressed or resolved in this speculative future society. They may never be resolved in contemporary society either.

Huxley contrasts this outwardly utopian setting of a technologically advanced, ultra civilised, perfectly stable and perfectly happy London with the wild Savage Reservation in Malpais that Bernard and Lenina visit. The Reservation is intended to represent the ‘uncivilised’ place against which the reader can measure the ‘civilized’ world presented thus far. In the absence of technological advances, here people age, women give birth and the natural sights and smells of decay and filth stand in stark contrast to the sterile, germ-free conditions of Bernard and Lenina’s world. The Reservation is presented with all the rawness of human experience, accompanied by all the unpleasantness that the World Controller explains that civilised society has long eradicated. In essence, the Indians’ lives in the Reservation represent the essential features of authentic human life that are familiar to the reader.

However, the binary opposition of civilised and primitive reveals the text’s own inherent contradiction; although the Reservation’s society seems more authentically human, it is nevertheless not an ideal alternative to the less authentic civilisation outside its walls. It is presented as more violent and cruel, leading the reader to question the morality of certain traditional practices. Both societies are panopticons but with different carceral mechanisms: while citizens of London are observed by their peers, citizens of Malpais are observed by wardens; while Londoners’ social mobility is limited by their caste, Malpais citizens’ physical mobility is limited by the walls around the Reservation.

Perhaps the greatest contrast is demonstrated by how these societies behave in group ceremonies. In London, Bernard takes part in a Solidarity Service at the Fordson Community Singery. This event is equated to a religious meeting that builds up to a frenzy of religious ecstasy and sexual excitement. The participants chant the following:

Orgy-porgy, Ford and fun,
Kiss the girls and make them One.
Boys at one with girls at peace;
Orgy-porgy gives release. (73)

The words in this chant emphasise the principles that this society values most, and the ceremony ends with the people feeling “the calm ecstasy of achieved consummation, the peace ... of balanced life, of energies at rest” (74). The frenzy has the effect of an opiate, intended, like all other aspects of this society, to contribute towards people’s feeling of happiness.

In Malpais, however, the religious ceremony in which the people who are referred to as savages are engaged is a frenzy of sadomasochistic violence. Whereas Bernard’s society worships Ford, the Indians worship both “Pookong and Jesus” (89) and while these Indians are presented as more authentically human, they are nevertheless brutal and violent. Bernard and Lenina witness a ceremony in which a human sacrificial victim is beaten into unconsciousness, and the onlookers attending this ceremony partake in this fierce frenzy. The violent nature of this culture is revealed particularly in John’s character and the violent behaviour he displays towards Lenina when he is angered, as well as self-flagellating in order to “purify” himself at the end of the novel.

Thus it is revealed that neither progressive civilisation nor its primitive alternative is privileged by the text because, while raw human experience is suppressed in one society, that very raw human experience is exposed and criticised in the other.

Keith Booker observes,

“Conformity in Huxley’s dystopian society is largely enforced through the proliferation of a passive mindlessness that renders the citizens incapable of the thought or feeling required to question the models provided for them by the ruling World Controllers” (1994: 57).

In Foucauldian terms, this means that discipline in Huxley’s society is achieved through the use of carceral mechanisms that are ultimately aimed at establishing complete social conformity by creating docile bodies. The novel’s supposed advocacy of docility stresses, in contrast, the “Disneyfication” of modern society, a concept that represents the “negative escapism that is specifically designed to divert attention from social problems in the “real world” (Booker 1994: 2). Similar to modern citizens visiting Disneyland, Huxley’s citizens go to the feelies, banal semi-pornographic films that stimulate not only sight and sound, but also touch and smell. These films provide mindless stimuli that lack any real content that may lead one to think critically. The feelies are thus a representation of the emptiness of popular culture,

which suppresses strong emotions and discourages thought. The docility with which visitors of Disneyland conform to conventions of consumer behaviour is mirrored in Huxley's citizens' embrace of the feelies.

In order to establish social conformity successfully in a functioning society, methods of constant, uninterrupted and subtle coercion must be exercised upon the bodies of all individuals so that individuality itself is inevitably totally suppressed. Accordingly, docility is accomplished by means of employing specific disciplinary methods of training the body. Huxley's caste system is representative of one of Foucault's disciplinary means of training bodies into docility. It employs a hierarchical system that organises individuals into classified ranks in order to keep the carceral city stable and functioning optimally. By ranking individuals according to the needs of this society, such as multiple identical Delta clones operating identical machines simultaneously, "it individualizes bodies by a location that ... distributes them and circulates them in a network of relations" (Foucault 1977: 146). This implies that each citizen's cast dictates that the tasks this individual what must perform, how he/she must behave, speak, dress and think. Stability is achieved by conditioning lower-class servants to like and fully accept their lowly positions. This acceptance eliminates possible conflict and subversive behaviour. As social mobility is impossible within this caste system, jealousy, the desire for power, ambition, greed and other human vices are eradicated. What is accomplished, then, is perpetual objectification through "subtle partitioning of individual behaviour" (Foucault 1977: 173). World Controller Mustapha Mond explains this necessity as follows:

Alphas can be completely socialized – but only on condition that you make them do Alpha work. Only an Epsilon can be expected to make Epsilon sacrifices, for the good reason that for him they aren't sacrifices; they're the line of least resistance. His conditioning has laid down rails along which he's got to run. He can't help himself; he's fore-doomed. Even after decanting, he's still inside a bottle – an invisible bottle of infantile and embryonic fixations. Each one of us ... goes through life inside a bottle. (Foucault 1977: 196)

Classifying individuals according to their caste "partitions" their behaviour so that they remain in a controlled state even when they are not enclosed by walls. Mond thus echoes Foucault's belief that society itself is the "invisible bottle" incarcerating individuals in the very fabric of conforming disciplinary practices. This is because classification creates "a sort of social 'quarantine', to an indefinitely generalizable mechanism of 'panopticism'" (Foucault 1977:

216); in other words, disciplinary power infiltrates nature as it links all forms of power, thereby making the effects of power possible and efficient.

Training the body to be docile through hierarchical observation is, according to Foucauldian thinking, a disciplinary mechanism that coerces the body by means of constant surveillance, thereby placing all human conduct under the microscope. Yet according to Booker, Huxley's society "relies more on conditioning before-the-fact than on surveillance after-the-fact to keep its citizens in line" (1994: 55). Nonetheless, although there is no ominous sign of the malevolent watchful eye of the tyrannical ruler in this novel, as opposed to for example to Orwell's *Big Brother* in *1984* (1949), citizens are observed by their peers. Booker argues that it is "not necessary literally to keep the population under official surveillance, because the fierce suppression of individuality in this society produces constant peer pressure that attaches a strong stigma to any deviation from the communal norm" (1994: 57). Fanny says to Lenina:

I really do think you ought to be careful. It's such horribly bad form to go on and on like this with one man. At forty, or thirty-five, it wouldn't be so bad. But at *your* age, Lenina! No, it really won't do. And you know how strongly the DHC objects to anything intense or long-drawn. Four months of Henry Foster, without having another man – why, he'd be furious if he knew ... (34-35)

The discourse here resonates with Foucault's supposition that hierarchical observation has a normalising effect. Barker states, "If normalization and the formation of knowledge in modern society provide the background for many of Foucault's major studies, it is because they refer back to formations whereby police police themselves and are able to police others" (1998: 66). Fanny's remarks above prove that in a carceral society, anyone can become the watchful eye of a police force. Thus, while conveying the social practice of compulsory sexual promiscuity, this conversation in a public bathroom suggests that being observable, even by a benign force such as a friend, disciplines individuals into practising self-policing, thereby producing docile behaviour with minimal effort. It facilitates "an internal, articulated and detailed control" (Foucault 1977: 172) in which an individual learns what role he/she is expected to play within society. When the Director wants to make a public example of Bernard's unorthodox behaviour, he states:

This man ... has grossly betrayed the trust imposed in him. By his heretical views on sport and *soma*, by the scandalous unorthodoxy of his sex-life, by his refusal to obey the teachings of Our Ford and behave out of office hours "like a babe in a bottle" ... he

has proved himself an enemy of Society, a subverter, ladies and gentlemen, of all Order and Stability, a conspirator against Civilization itself. For this reason I propose to dismiss him, to dismiss him with ignominy from the post he has held in this Centre; I propose forthwith to apply for his transference to a Sub-Centre of the lowest order and, that his punishment may serve the best interest of Society, as far as possible removed from any important Centre of population. In Iceland he will have small opportunity to lead others astray by his unfordly example. (129-130)

According to Foucault, individuals such as Bernard and all the citizens of this society can be considered as subjects who know and in that knowing are “initialled into fields of practice and technologies where regimes of true and false are circulated” (Baker 1998: 66-67). One such technology is the technology of power. Being observable is a strong power relation because it determines “the conduct of individuals and submit[s] them to certain ends or domination” (Foucault in Baker 1998: 67), while at the same time objectivising the subject. Therefore, constant societal observation makes every aspect of Bernard’s life public knowledge because the public is included in the discursive practices that validate the Director’s discourse. Because Bernard’s personal conduct deviates from the established norm of his caste and, in fact, of his entire society, the Director has at his disposal enough accusatory material to label Bernard “an enemy of Society”. The Director implies that Bernard’s observable conduct has been undisciplined, and peer pressure and public shame are sufficient to validate Bernard’s exile from civilised society. This event therefore shows that social condemnation is a disciplinary power relation that has imbedded mechanisms of self-sustainability, making it both transparent, as it is everywhere and always attentive, and subtle, as it functions simultaneously and perpetually in silence.

The text exposes its own contradictions just a few moments later when Bernard brings Linda and John into the room. The Director is the very person who impregnated Linda and abandoned her in the Savage Reservation. Bernard reveals to the onlookers that the Director is in fact John’s biological father and the crowd bursts out in uncontrollable laughter. In this dystopia, the idea of live birth is obscene and the notion of a ‘father’ is considered a “scatological joke” (Booker 1994: 53). By shaming the Director, Bernard proves that he is guilty of the very same unorthodoxy of which he has accused Bernard. In this way, an unstable opposition between the individual and society is created. Booker notes, “Foucault usefully problematize[s] the fundamental individual versus society opposition so common to dystopian fiction by suggesting that the individual is largely a social phenomenon and that the two poles of this

opposition therefore cannot be neatly separated” (1994: 56). Firstly, the Director’s conduct is hypocritical. While he presents himself as a pious protector of social stability, and therefore aims to banish Bernard in an attempt to guard that stability, his real reason stems from his concern that Bernard may reveal his (the Director’s) unorthodox feelings for Linda, which he accidentally disclosed to Bernard earlier in the novel. Secondly, the problem with Bernard’s conduct in this event is twofold: his individuality is the cause of the Director’s public shaming, yet at the same time it is Bernard’s longing to gain social standing that causes him to maliciously condemn the Director and to use the spectacle of the ugly fat woman and wild man to elevate his position in society.

Foucault stresses that disciplinary methods can only be sustained under certain conditions and when certain techniques are employed. In Foucauldian thinking, disciplinary conditions are suitable if an institution has an enclosed space that acts as a protected place with certain rules. Though Huxley’s world is not a literally enclosed utopian space such as More’s island of Utopia, in this carceral city the caste system itself provides the enclosed space within which citizens must follow the rules of conduct as dictated by their class. As Mostapha Mond states, “Each one of us ... goes through life inside a bottle” (196); no matter who you are, your social status still limits your existence as your entire existence is defined by the category, in this case caste, into which you are placed.

Once citizens are decanted and conditioned to think and act in the way their class is supposed to, disciplinary measures need to continue. This is accomplished through the control of their activities by means of the regulation of their time and the training of their bodies according to the needs of their society. The activities that fill the daily lives of the citizens of *BNW* are focused primarily on the promotion of consumerism and the hedonistic pursuit of pleasure. Consumption is such a fundamental aspect of this society that Huxley makes it his first example when the Director takes his group of students to the infant conditioning room. Here, the babies are presented with books and flowers and then given mild electric shocks, which are accompanied by a booming alarm. The Director explains that this technique, repeated 200 times, conditions children to hate books and nature. By hating books, the Director claims, the lower castes will not waste the community’s time by reading books that may “decondition” them. In essence, reading is a solitary activity and in a society that is devoted to “Community, Identity, Stability” (5), citizens are conditioned to be uncomfortable with solitude. During Lenina and Bernard’s first date, Bernard hovers his helicopter over the Channel to enjoy

looking at the sea because it makes him feel more like an individual. Lenina is so horrified by Bernard's need to be alone and separated from the social body, that all she can muster in response is hypnopaedic phrases:

“It's horrible, it's horrible,’ she kept repeating. ‘And how can you talk like that about not wanting to be a part of the social body? After all, everyone works for everyone else. We can't do without anyone. Even Epsilons ...” (78)

Reflecting on her date with Bernard, Lenina thinks about the following:

That mania, to start with, for doing things in private. Which meant, in practice, not doing anything at all. For what was there that one could do in private. (Apart, of course, from going to bed: but one couldn't do that all the time.) Yes, what was there? Precious little. (76)

Bernard and Lenina's date, and Lenina's reflection on that date, present the discursive formations that prove that not only are citizens conditioned to dislike activities that promote thought and feeling, but more importantly, that this carceral city has incorporated disciplinary mechanisms into the available activities that citizens are conditioned to enjoy. The only activities that are available to them are by their very design meant to be done by more than one person. Furthermore, this ensures that self-policing and peer pressure are in practice at all times, and that observational practices remain in place constantly.

The inculcation of a hatred for books and nature demonstrated by the Director in the nursery forms part of the conditioning objective to force citizens to sustain the capitalist economic system that Huxley criticises so strongly. Mustapha Mond comments, “You can't consume much if you sit still and read books” (42). This demonstrates that human behaviour is conditioned and activities are designed in such a way that the population of this carceral city constantly seeks to consume goods and services as much as possible. While observing a group of twenty children playing a game, the Director comments:

Imagine the folly of allowing people to play elaborate games which do nothing whatever to increase consumption. It's madness. Nowadays the Controllers won't approve of any new game unless it can be shown that it requires at least as much apparatus as the most complicated of existing games. (25-26)

The discourse here reveals that consumerism is an essential carceral mechanism in this society as consumption and the enjoyment of consumption are the primary activities that citizens are trained to participate in. The constant production and consumption of goods and services ensures employment and keeps the economy stable. Booker argues that “Materialistic self-indulgence in this hedonistic society is openly encouraged, because those who are indulgent will consume more and thus keep the economy rolling” (1994: 63). In order to stimulate consumption and materialism, citizens are conditioned with hypnopaedic phrases such as “old clothes are beastly”, “always throw away old clothes”, “the more stitches the less riches” and “ending is better than mending” (42). This produces a thoroughly commodified society, one in which commodification is entirely embedded in its discourse, and therefore its culture.

In *The History of Sexuality* (1978), Foucault argues that sexuality is “an especially dense transfer point for relations of power”, a power relation “with the greatest instrumentality: useful for the greatest number of manoeuvres and capable of serving as a point of support, as a linchpin, for the most varied strategies” (1978: 103). Here, Foucault emphasises how deeply influential sex and sexuality can be; sex is a space where individuals are permitted to know each other at a deeper level that is quite different from other aspects of human relations. Scholars have agreed that in most dystopias, sexuality is often linked to revolution and that control of sexuality is a means of controlling power, access to power and thoughts about accessing power. As Booker points out, control of sexuality is a means to “prevent the buildup of potentially subversive political energies” (1994: 49).

In early utopias such as Plato’s *Republic*, emotional suppression is achieved through suppression of sexual passions by regulating sexual conduct through strict bureaucratic institutions such as marriage. George Orwell adopted this mechanism in his dystopian novel *1984* (1949) as a means of illustrating the connection between unregulated sexual conduct and revolution. In Huxley’s carceral city, however, sexual permissiveness is a fundamental power relation that permeates the entire culture of this society. By encouraging sexual promiscuity, sex becomes devalued, a virtually meaningless though pleasurable activity that eradicates passion and its threat to social stability. Citizens are conditioned from early childhood to regard sex as a pleasurable recreational activity akin to sport, an activity that allows them to amuse themselves:

In a little grassy bay between tall clumps of Mediterranean heather, two children, a little boy of about eleven and a little girl who might have been a year older, were playing, very gravely and with all the focused attention of scientists intent on a labour of discovery. A rudimentary sexual game. (26)

Sexual discourse involving children would certainly be disturbing to contemporary society, but in this society, public sexual play aims to condition children to view sex as a natural activity that is associated only with pleasure, and not with procreation, passion or emotion. Monogamy, however, is a sign of deviant antisocial behaviour in *BNW*. Close bonds created by conventional sexuality, such as family relations, are deemed as “suffocating intimacies, ... dangerous, insane obscene relationships” (31). Mustapha Mond makes the following statement about conventional society before the State changed their society’s perceptions of sexuality:

“Our Freud had been the first to reveal the appalling dangers of family life. The world was full of fathers – was therefore full of misery; full of mothers – therefore of every kind of perversion from sadism to chastity; full of brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts – full of madness and suicide” (33).

“... they were forced to feel strongly. And feeling strongly (and strongly, what was more, in solitude, in hopelessly individual isolation), how could they be stable?” (35)

In contrast to the Platonian disciplinary mechanism of repressing sexuality itself, Huxley’s society “elects the alternative strategy of stigmatizing monogamy to defuse the emotional charge normally associated with sexual relationships” (Booker 1994: 54). The negative connotations in Mond’s discourse implies that control of sexuality through marriage and family is what contributed to the chaos and destruction of the world before the World State came into being. The distinctly human capacity to feel strongly is associated with isolation and instability. Control of sexual activity is thus a carceral disciplinary mechanism that subdues the subversive potential of human emotion itself. This mechanism also has a commodifying effect. The discursive formation, “Everyone belongs to everyone else” (37), a hypnopaedic proverb repeated several times throughout the novel, dehumanises individuals and implies that human beings have material value. This can be observed in the discourse of Henry Foster when he speaks to another man about Lenina:

“Oh, she’s a splendid girl. Wonderfully pneumatic. I’m surprised you haven’t had her. (37)”

“Yes, I really do advise you to try her.” (39)

Bernard, overhearing this conversation, observes that the men talk about Lenina as if she is “a piece of meat” (39). Indeed, the society’s language itself lacks the discourse of conventional sexual expression and has instead substituted it with the discourse of commodification. Humans form part of the chain of supply and demand. By “having” another person, people are simply by means of discursive practices deemed to be commodities to be consumed like any other mass-produced meat. These discursive formations reveal that consumption is part of the daily life of citizens and therefore the very concept is embedded in how they view themselves and others.

While it is proclaimed that citizens are allowed free sexual conduct not limited by monogamy or institutionalised marriage, free sexual conduct is nevertheless institutionalised conduct. The natural human sexual impulse is still controlled because no citizen has, from the moment of birth, the freedom to choose monogamy or chastity. In a society that institutionalises erotic play for children as a sexual conditioning tool and in a society that is designed in such a way that antisocial behaviour has dire consequences, sexual promiscuity is still state-sanctioned conduct and not at all a benign societal structure. In this carceral city, social conformity is thus a compulsory practice that has the same disciplinary effect as imprisonment and reformation, where citizens are trained to display the correct and desirable behaviour that suits the needs of the institution.

Although Mond’s comments on the dangerous potential of viviparous conventional sexuality may echo some truth, the alternative is not presented as desirable either. Huxley opposes civilised society’s views on sexuality with the conventional views on Christian sexual morality practised in the Savage Reservation. The Indian savages still maintain monogamous relationships, but conversations with John reveal that these relationships often lead to jealousy and violence. Women attack Linda violently because she sleeps with their husbands. Linda sees no harm in having sexual contact with their husbands because her civilised discourse does not include any reference to what monogamy is or even what the word ‘husband’ means. Having sex with the men of the Reservation is her attempt to conform to the social norms that form part of her discourse but not that of the Reservation. In essence, her conduct is the only way she knows to be part of the social body and having sex with several men is the only way she knows to be socially accepted by the society in which she was abandoned.

In another instance, Lenina attempts to seduce John. His conventional views on monogamy, as well as his own Shakespearean conditioning, trigger a violent revulsion for her and himself. John's somewhat accidental sexual conditioning causes him to develop an aversion for sex. Early in his life, his mother's lover Popé pushed John out of the bedroom whenever he visited Linda for sex. John also witnessed how women whipped Linda because of her overt sexual freedom. As a boy, he struggled to find social acceptance among the other children because of his mother's reputation. As a result, John associates sex with an absent and intoxicated mother, physical abuse and humiliation. Together with this, John's only other reference to sexual conduct stems from Shakespearean characters such as Hamlet and Othello, whose violent conduct towards women contributes to forming his confused perceptions of male-female sexual relations. His attitude towards sex thus becomes one of aversion and he responds to these intense feelings in the same physically violent way as Popé, the village women and most of all, his beloved Shakespearean substitute role models of Othello and Hamlet.

The oppositions of the dehumanising potential of free sex and the conventional sexual bonds established through monogamous relationships and family bonds are thus revealed as unstable, as both the repression of sexuality in conventional Christian morality and the devaluation of sex are still institutionalised practises. Both sides of the binary in this dystopia "represent obstacles to the achievement of genuine intersubjective attachments" (Booker 1994: 54), thus revealing the undecidability of the text's ideological project.

In Huxley's *BNW*, the "drive for universal happiness amounts to little more than a subtle form of tyranny and subjugation" (Booker 1994:48). Thus, in order to discipline this society to become docile bodies, this carceral city needs not only to train its citizens to behave correctly by conditioning them to pursue pleasure, but also to train them to believe that everybody is happy at all times. In this society, happiness and stability are inter-dependent. In order to maintain economic stability, disciplinary mechanisms of production and consumption are incorporated in the societal design, as already discussed. However, because the human condition is itself an unstable construct, disciplinary mechanisms that ensure emotional, psychological and social stability should also be incorporated in the carceral mechanisms of that society. To this end, the societal structure is designed in such a way that citizens are mostly under the influence of more than one opiate. At the end of the novel, Mustapha Mond explains to John:

“People are happy; they get what they want, and they never want what they can’t get. They’re well off; they’re safe; they’re never ill; they’re not afraid of death; they’re blissfully ignorant of passion and old age; they’re plagued with no mothers or fathers; they’ve got no wives, or children, or lovers to feel strongly about; they’re so conditioned that they practically can’t help behaving as they ought to behave. And if anything should go wrong, there’s *soma*.” (194)

Soma is an example of Suvin’s concept of the ‘novum’, a scientifically plausible innovation that is conceivable because within the realm of fiction, the concept can be credibly related to reality. As part of his social critique, Huxley incorporates drug dependence into the discourse of his novel as a carceral mechanism that keeps citizens docile. *Soma* is a drug that is produced and distributed by World State and has “[a]ll the advantages of Christianity and alcohol; none of their defects” (46). *Soma* is the primary means of incapacitation in this dystopia and is incorporated in almost everything that people consume. Designed to eliminate feelings of unhappiness, *soma* is a non-toxic drug that has no unpleasant side effects and succeeds in numbing the senses to such a degree that citizens are incapable of perceiving the emptiness of their own lives. People take *soma* holidays when they endure anything that their conditioning has deemed unsavoury. Whenever any unpleasant situation or feelings arise, citizens are conditioned to take *soma* by hypnopaedic phrases such as “one cubic centimetre cures ten gloomy sentiments” (46) or “a gramme is better than a damn” (47).

This society’s dependence on *soma* mirrors Western society’s dependence on pharmaceuticals, and criticises humanity’s tendency to favour escape from the unpleasant aspects that form such an integral part of the human experience. This critique is clearly expressed in the character Linda, the unfortunate woman who was abandoned and forgotten in the Savage Reservation. Pregnant and separated from all that she knows, filled with the shame of becoming a mother and without any *soma*, Linda resorts to drinking *mescal*, a hallucinogenic drug made by the Indians, finding it similar to *soma* despite the fact that it makes her feel terrible the next day. Her state of permanent intoxication is a contributing factor to her inability to engage in the viviparous traditional culture from which she might have been able to learn how to be a mother to John, the son for whom she consequently feels a mixture of love and revulsion. Once back in London, Linda goes on a permanent *soma* holiday and inevitably finds release in the death that her addiction causes. Despite the fact that doctors know that abusing *soma* will lead to a shortening of life, Dr Shaw has the following to say when John expresses his concern for his mother’s *soma* abuse:

“*Soma* may make you lose a few years in time,” the doctor went on. But think of the enormous, immeasurable durations it can give you out of time. Every *soma*-holiday is a bit of what our ancestors used to call eternity. ... Of course,” Dr Shaw went on, “you can’t allow people to go popping off into eternity if they’ve got any serious work to do. But as she hasn’t got any serious work ...” (134)

These discursive formations reveal how this society’s notions of the benefits and detriments of drug dependence may both resemble and differ from that of contemporary society. Because Linda has not received the anti-aging treatments that are conventional in this society, her appearance makes it impossible for her to reintegrate into the society from which she has been separated for so long. Linda has thus lost her value as worker, spender and sex partner and can no longer function as a manufactured part of consumer society. Her death also highlights another dehumanising aspect of this society. Booker notes that the “lack of aging prevents the usual reminders of approaching death, and death itself is devalued as an insignificant event” (1994:65). The value of human life is diminished by the fact that citizens are conditioned to view death not as tragic or meaningful. Linda’s death from a *soma* overdose is therefore significant in that it emphasises that once a person is no longer of use to this society, he/she can be discarded like any other expired product; the passing of a person is of no consequence.

The notion of happiness that the text initially promotes may seem utopian according to conventional views. It advocates freedom from emotional suffering, freedom from suffering from illness and the deteriorating effects of aging, freedom from political turmoil and the resulting chaos and destruction, and the freedom to be instantly gratified by anything that gives one pleasure. If citizens are conditioned from before birth to accept their social position and to like who they are and what they do, and society is stable because of this, should this carceral city in fact be considered a bad place? Naomi Jacobs argues that “the repulsive force of classical dystopia comes from its portrayal of a world drained of agency – of an individual’s capacity to choose and to act, or a group’s capacity to influence and intervene in social formations” (2003: 92). In other words, utopian notions can be deconstructed as dystopian because characters’ understanding of the role that personal agency plays in happiness differs. The carceral mechanisms embedded in Huxley’s society are such powerful social formations that citizens lack the capacity for self-awareness required to realise they have been deprived of agency since before they were decanted. They are trained through conditioning to internalise the norms of a dystopian carceral city and to be not only docile, but also content with being inseparable from the collective. Foucault calls the norm one of the “great instruments of power” (Foucault 1977:

184) as it imposes homogeneity while differentiating individuals. Because free agency is based in individuality, the norm of this carceral city is to make identity and community inseparable in a resilient caste system, so that one's individuality cannot possibly be based on individuality, but on one's position in the collective. This results in disciplinary power that is unconsciously internalised, thus eliminating the need for a violent enforcement of norms.

An individual with free agency can thus be considered a delinquent, someone who displays abnormal behavioural patterns and thinking and whose personality itself is an offence against the norms. As a social deviant, he is set apart from the rest of society as 'the other' and is in fact a creation of the operation of the penitentiary. Huxley's society is governed by norms more than by laws, and therefore members of society will police themselves into correct behaviour in order to avoid the threat of delinquency. Stability can be achieved when otherness is abolished, because society can be conditioned to think, act and be the same. The concept of delinquency is essential to understanding dystopian discourse as the protagonist of a dystopian novel is in most cases a delinquent who shows a desire for personal agency; as a result of this individuality, such a person cannot be disciplined by the carceral mechanisms of that society.

Three characters find it difficult to come to terms with the societal design of a civilised society. Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson are friends because both have 'abnormal' qualities that make them social outcasts. Helmholtz is an exceptionally intelligent Alpha Plus who lectures at the College of Emotional Engineering and is dissatisfied with fact that his writing potential is restricted to the limitations of hypnopaedic phrases. Unfulfilled and unhappy with the meaninglessness of sex and *soma*, Helmholtz feels empty and expresses a desire for self-expression through good and meaningful poetry. Contrary to his friend Bernard, he is excited by the idea of being banished from society. When asked by Mustapha Mond at the end of the novel if there is a particular place to which he would like to be exiled, Helmholtz requests somewhere unpleasant where he can experience some form of suffering. He is excited by the idea of exile because it will allow him to experience choice and pain, two essential parts of human life that he believes will give him the depth of human experience for which he longs.

Bernard Marx is the delinquent who takes the central role in the novel before the introduction of John the Savage. His desire for personal agency stems from the anger he feels towards those who ridicule him because of his inferior physical stature. Though an Alpha Plus, Bernard is too short for his caste and this physical attribute links him to the lower caste, with the result that

he does not enjoy the respect and benefits reserved for the elite. Described by Lenina as odd yet sweet, Bernard lacks confidence, is shallow and egotistical and in general cowardly. The reader's empathy for Bernard fades once he proves himself a hypocrite. Initially, Bernard expresses a desire to be more of an individual, someone outside the social body. As a psychologist and specialist in hypnopaedia, Bernard is unfortunately more aware of the carceral mechanisms that train people into docility, therefore less susceptible to emotional conditioning. He knows exactly how many repetitions of hypnopaedic phrases people need to receive for a notion to become a truth. Bernard is thus more inclined to resist the disciplinary mechanisms that aim to rob him entirely of his desire to be an individual. However, because Bernard lacks the courage to act on his unsuppressed feelings, he is proved to be a hypocrite when he returns from Malpais with a savage for every upper-class citizen to see. His association with John gives Bernard the popularity and social acceptance that he has never had. Contrary to the true delinquent, Bernard lacks the moral backbone required to resist conforming to social practices. Where before he scorned the degrading notion of 'having' multiple sex partners, and objected to meaningless recreational sex, as soon as he becomes socially successful, he embraces the societal norms of recreational sex and *soma*. His shallowness is revealed not only in his shameless boasts to Helmholtz, but also in his reluctance to sacrifice the comforts of civilisation for the autonomy he claims to have desired.

In contrast to London's docile citizens, John the Savage is a unique human being with identity and a concept of family. To a certain extent, John's character proves Foucault's statement that the "prison cannot fail to produce delinquents" (1997: 264). The Savage Reservation is in essence a prison outside the civilised world, where 'primitive' Indians are enclosed behind walls and guarded by wardens. John's delinquency stems from his disconnection to both worlds presented in the novel. Although naturally born in the Reservation and the son of two upper-class citizens of the civilised world, John's marginalisation as an outsider in Malpais drives him to embrace the realm of Shakespeare as his society. In complete contrast to Bernard, who expresses his dissatisfaction with society through resentful whining, John has the courage to reject the society he names the 'brave new world' – Hermia's statement in *The Tempest*, thus linking the novel to Shakespeare's role in society – by living out his ideals, however foolishly. Driven by sadness over Linda's death and disgust at the children in the hospital ward and the identical adults waiting in queues for *soma*, John causes a riot by throwing the *soma* tablets out of the window. In this incident, the text deconstructs its own ideological project by validating Mustapha Mond's statement that uncensored literature such as Shakespeare, together with

strong passions can cause social instability. It also exposes the very part of humanity believed to be the cause of conflict and strife as, once again, out of frustration and anger, John behaves violently against those who do not comprehend or accept his deviant values.

The characterisation of John the Savage reveals a problem in the text's opposition of individual and society. By nature an unstable character, John is neither a villain nor a hero. He longs for a world filled with beauty yet reacts with violent fury when he feels conflicted. Most importantly, however, though John inevitably finds civilised society with its docile identical clones sterile and meaningless, John himself has been just as conditioned by Malpais, and by Shakespeare's works particularly. In fact, John quotes lines from Shakespeare as often as civilised citizens repeat their hypnopædic phrases. His discourse reveals how his Shakespearean conditioning shapes his anticipations and responses to all his experiences. Clearly, John's Shakespearean expectations are incompatible with the real-world conditions he encounters and although Shakespeare may be a much richer stimulus for developing knowledge on the human condition, John lacks the ability to apply his learned knowledge appropriately. His agency is just as limited by his conditioning as that of the members of civilised society. However, whereas lack of agency allows citizens to conform socially and be part of a collective, John's alienation increases as he chooses to live out his freedom in isolation in an abandoned lighthouse.

John's conduct in the lighthouse highlights another contradiction. In an attempt to purify himself of his sexual longing for Lenina and also to rid himself of the filth of civilisation, John practises self-flagellation and induced vomiting. Unable to rid himself of the guilt he feels over his mother's death, he does not allow himself to enjoy the simplest of pleasures. John's life of intense self-punishment is a life of self-induced pain and is in essence just as empty and purposeless as the self-serving life of comfort and pleasure of the citizens of London. His attempt to seek personal freedom through suffering and self-denial does not bring him happiness or purpose. Instead, he traps himself in another prison, himself. John's ritual flagellation draws a crowd of people and in his attempt to chase them away, he unknowingly provides them with pleasurable entertainment. Overcome by religious and sexual hysteria similar to that witnessed at the Solidarity Service, John unwillingly becomes part of the pleasure-seeking society from which he has tried to escape, and he succumbs to the sexual desire against which he has fought so desperately.

Through the difficulties experienced by John the Savage, Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson and their inability to accept the social norm of “everybody belongs to everybody” (37), the reader is able to understand that in a world where your caste determines your worth and conformity causes disembodiment, nothing has true meaning, and no one is truly free. In the final conversation between Mustapha Mond and John, Huxley once again directs his social criticism towards the increasing value that Western society places on consumerism. By Mond explicitly stating what his society has sacrificed for the sake of stability and happiness, and the reasons behind this, Huxley emphasises the point that concepts that are deemed sacred in Western society, such as freedom, truth, love, relationships and equality, are in danger of being replaced by the meaningless values of consumer culture. For John, accepting all the horrors of sickness, poverty, fear and unhappiness means claiming the right to be authentically human. John and Mond’s incompatible world-views, John’s advocacy of freedom and Mond’s support for stability and comfort, echo the conflicting nature of our own societies’ values. Because the text privileges neither world, it also invites the reader to consider the cost of living as an individual in either a utopian or dystopian reality. Whichever option is preferable to the reader both are nevertheless carceral in nature.

As a satire of conventional society, *BNW* is an attack on utopianism. Huxley presents the possibility that trusting scientific and technological advances to establish a better place may have unwanted and devastating consequences for the human condition itself. Humanity and society are not synonymous concepts, and in order to establish a better place, dystopian writers suggest that the one must be sacrificed to realise the other. A Marxist World State of centralisation, surveillance and utilitarianism may bring universal happiness, safety and stability, but the cost of establishing and maintaining such a society may just be too high. Huxley’s novel presents an alarming possibility of a very conceivable future that may have already become our present, as it proves that totalitarianism and loss of individual freedom need not be imbedded in diabolical governmental enforcement. Instead, it suggests that disciplining society can be, and might already be, accomplished by the disciplinary practices that are already an inherent part of society.

CHAPTER 3: JASPER FFORDE'S *SHADES OF GREY*

Post-structuralist discourse theory posits that language creates social reality despite the fact that the relationship between discourse and social practices may take different forms. For Derrida, discourse acts as a model for a deconstructive reading of texts while for Foucault, discourse is the means by which language connects with issues to do with its relations with the social and institutional settings that govern the production of statements at certain times and places. In essence, language use reveals how human behaviour is shaped by a particular vocabulary and knowledge in particular historical periods. Foucault argues that each society has “the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true” (1980: 131). He defines discourse somewhat vaguely as “a group of verbal performances ... which was produced by the groups of signs” and adds that discourse “is constituted by a group of sequences of signs, in so far as they are statements ... in so far as they can be assigned particular modalities of existence” (1972: 107). This means that because discourse generates knowledge and truth, specific discourses in particular contexts have the power to influence individuals to accept statements as true. The discourse of a text has the power to create the reality of its world by shaping the perceptions of those using its discursive formations. In turn, the discourse will reveal knowledge about those using it, not only about the user’s gender or class position, for example, but also and particularly the user’s inferred relationship to others. Finally, discourse is closely involved with socially established networks of power that not only give certain authority to certain users, but also grant these users the power to influence how social organisation shapes how the world is interpreted by others.

The power of discourse to create a world is masterfully illustrated in Jasper Fforde’s extraordinary satire *Shades of Grey*. Fforde’s world is complex in its uniqueness and bizarre yet fascinating aspects. He spends more than half of the novel introducing and developing his newly imagined concepts and features. In fact, it seems that in its entirety, Fforde gives more attention to world-building than plot in the novel. The protagonist, Eddie Russett, is a citizen of Chromatacia, a dystopian society in which the quasi-human citizens function 496 years after a cataclysmic event known as the “Something that Happened” (2009: 9), setting the novel at least two world orders into the future. For reasons that are never explained to the reader, the bodily composition of humans is different or has been altered so that the pupils of their eyes are tiny dots that can only perceive a limited array of colours. Consequently, all aspects of this society, from one’s name and social standing to city names, medicines and food, are categorised

and prioritised according to their colour. The ability to see colours is a commodity that determines the wealth and social status of individuals within the Collective. In Chromatacia, you are your colour and everything you do is in pursuit of the enjoyment of colour.

The protagonist and first-person narrator, Eddie Russett, is sent to the city of East Carmine to conduct a chair census in order to learn humility. On his way there, he helps his father save the life of a man who wears the wrong identifying marker – something that sparks his curiosity and sets in motion his quest to find out who this man is and why he almost died. He also meets the rebellious Jane G23 and is intrigued by her audacity in undermining the Rules and refusing to act according to her place in society. As the plot unfolds, Eddie discovers many secrets that are hidden by the hegemony, including the fact that people who fail to conform to society's norms are not in fact sent away to be re-educated, but are instead secretly killed in an effort to maintain the longevity of the Stasis.

The laws of this colour-obsessed carceral city, known as the Rules and varying from rational to bizarre, are set by its founder, Munsell. He is the creator of the Munsell colour system, which specifies colour according to hue (tone/shade), value (lightness) and chroma (purity) on a numerical scale. The society observes a strict social hierarchy that is based on one's ability to see colour, as individuals' colour perception is limited to the degrees of one or at most two hues. The "Colortocracy" – a satirical play on the word aristocracy and based on the class system of Edwardian England – places the Purples at the top of this hierarchy, followed by the Blues, Greens, Yellows, Oranges and Reds. The monochromatic Greys, whose last names are not hue-based like the rest of society but rather numerical, are worker drones with the fewest rights and are the lowest of them all. In order to establish some form of social mobility, as it is not skills and hard work but the amount of colour one can see from birth that determines one's social position, citizens adopt a type of home eugenics by arranging marriages that might ensure offspring with a better perception of the desired hue. Because colour perception is limited and because it seems as if colour is beginning to vanish from the world systematically, colours are mined from abandoned areas left by the previous civilisation, aptly known as "the Previous" (2009: 5). Expensive synthetic colours that can be perceived by everyone have also been developed and are incorporated into as many aspects of daily life as can be afforded. Citizens are required to wear a synthetically coloured spot of their particular hue as an identifying marker so that everyone can see to which colour class they belong. Chromatacia's governing system is based, in a literal sense, on the rule system of an English public school.

Citizens are awarded merits and demerits, wear badges on their lapels and are supervised by monitors and prefects. Technology is very simplistic and highly regulated by what is known as “Leapbacks” (2009: 78), periods during which certain aspects of civil life are banned indefinitely. Perhaps most importantly, though, language and conduct are strictly regulated by the Rules in such a way that swearing is illegal and good manners are mandatory. People accept their way of life passively as from a young age they are discouraged from being curious, desiring instead uneventful futures and frowning on any notions of change.

Fforde’s novel balances its depiction of utilisation of science and technology in a pure dystopian spirit by mixing the familiar with speculation of future technological innovations. Although the reader can infer that many forms of known technology have been wiped from the world, what is clear is that scientific innovation has progressed to a level that is appropriate to society’s immediate priorities, which is to enable citizens to perceive all colours. Fforde bleeds the familiar into the unfamiliar by using discourse that equates their method of distributing colour to the Internet. The Chromatic elite, known as National Colour, supply citizens with expensive synthetic hues that everyone can distinguish. Together with this, every village possesses a communal garden that employs a network of capillary feed-pipes that colourise the garden with a splendid variety of synthetic hues that all citizens can enjoy as much as they wish. Only wealthy villages can afford to connect to the Grid, which stores and distributes the enumerable varieties of colours, however.

In contrast to the complexities of this world, the plot is a typical and simple dystopian one. After a prank goes wrong, the protagonist Eddie Russett, who is from a low-level Red family, is sent to the outer-fringe town of East Carmine to learn humility by conducting a chair census. In the Outer Fringes, the Rules are more relaxed than where he comes from and he meets Jane G23, a low-class Grey with a nose that Eddie finds extremely attractive. The more “loopholery” (2009: 30) and bending of the Rules he witnesses, the more his previously content eyes are opened. He becomes disillusioned with his perfectly docile life back home where he is half-promised to marry into the Oxblood family. Eddie embarks on a journey of truth-seeking when he discovers that much of what the public knows about what happens to citizens who are sent to “Reboot”, is false. When people have earned so many demerits that they have proved that they have strayed from the path of collective good conduct, they are informed that they will be sent to Reboot just outside Emerald City, supposedly a re-education centre where they will be taught some manners. By the end of the novel, with Jane by his side, Eddie discovers that the

Night Train does not take the Rebootees to Emerald City to be re-conditioned instead, they are transported to the city of High Saffron where they are put to death.

Fforde's novel includes discourse which privileges certain modes of relating to this world in terms of colour. Barker argues that "if language and the world were identical, language would be redundant; it would in fact *be* the world" (1998: 11). This suggests that contemporary discourse does not have the same discursive support in the world of Fforde's novel because the discursive formations of its discourse apply to different knowledge. All notions related to colour form part of intricate networks of statements that make knowledge possible and delineate what can be said or understood within this discourse. Eddie Russett's world is characterised by discourse related to colour designation. Because marriage arrangements and family social status tend to dominate a significant part of the narrative, the first instance in which this becomes apparent is in the nature of family names. Not only does each family name provide an obvious indication of *which* colour perception that family belongs to, but it also indicates the *degree* of that colour perception:

The Oxbloods were strictly old-color and preferred muted tones of paint wherever possible, even though they could have afforded to decorate their house to the highest chroma. Actually, much to them was vulgar, and that included the Russetts, whom they regarded as *nouveau couleur*. (2009: 4)

This discourse firstly reveals that both families belong to the Red section of society. However, because the name Russett denotes a rusty brownish-red colour while Oxblood denotes a rich dark red, the implication is that the Oxblood family has a higher social standing because their colour perception is 'redder' than that of the Russetts. The discursive formations in this extract also highlight the satirical nature of the discourse of the text. The mention of "old-color" and "*nouveau couleur*" places the notions of colour and wealth in the same discursive field, thereby defamiliarising the concept of *nouveau riche* and reconstructing it in a new discursive formation that equates colour to wealth. Because colour dominates the discourse of the citizens of this society, the knowledge existing in the structures, interconnections and associations built into language generates the necessary truth-effect, thereby rendering the colour-augmented discursive formations appropriate and effective in the context of the novel's setting.

Fforde also merges colour with the discursive formations in medical discourse. Eddie's father, Holden Russett, practises Chromaticology, which is this world's system of medicine. Doctors

are called Swatchmen because they use small glass swatch discs containing various hues to heal all manner of ailments. Swatchmen flash swatches of particular colours before a person's eyes for a certain time and this induces a physical response to the healing hue in the patient. Stopping in the town of Vermillion on their way to East Carmine, Eddie and his father's tour of the town is interrupted by a man, who appears to belong to the Purple class, collapsing in a Paint Shop. Eddie helps his father treat the patient; they attach a type of heart monitor to his ear to monitor his vital signs and place spectacles over his eyes to offset colour to "Standard Vision" (2009: 16) – a setting on the spectacles that ensures that all shades of colour will have an effect on his cortex:

"Sixty-eight point two foot-candles left eye", said Dad as he slipped the disc into the appropriate side of the spectacles. He set the light value into his flasher, and a high-pitched whine told us the device was charging. I dutifully wrote the time, code, dosage and eye on the Purple's forehead so follow-on practitioners would know what had been given, and as soon as the flasher was ready, Dad called out, "Cover!" and all those in the shop closed their eyes tightly. I heard a high-pitched squeak as the flasher discharged the light through the colored glass and the offset, and from there to the retina and the man's visual cortex. It was an odd feeling that you never really became used to. My first flash had been for my combined Ebola-Measles-H6N14 inoculation at age six, and for a brief exciting moment I could see music and hear colors – or at least, that's what it felt like. I also salivated for the rest of the day, which was usual, and could smell bread for a week, which wasn't. (2009: 16)

As Foucault states, "such discourses as economics, medicine, grammar, the science of living beings give rise to certain organizations of concepts, certain regroupings of objects, certain types of enunciation, which form, according to their degree of coherence, rigour, and stability, themes or theories ... Whatever their formal level may be, I shall call these themes and theories 'strategies'" (1972: 64). This suggests that by organising concepts that arise from medical discourse, in this case methods of resuscitation, and adjusting the discursive formations according to the conditions of the world of the text, Fforde successfully creates a strategy in which flashing coloured swatches can be fully understood as a medicinal practice. In addition, Fforde includes further satirical effects by playing with familiar discursive formations of the resuscitation procedure – such as a doctor yelling "Clear!" followed by the sound of the discharge of the defibrillator – and adjusting them to the truth-conditions of a world in which colour-stimulation of the visual cortex has the same resuscitating effect on a patient. Similarly, swatches are flashed before patients for various other medicinal purposes, from putting a stop to bleeding to initiating ovulation.

The same rules for these colour-based discursive formations are applied to other concepts in the discourse. Certain shades of green have varying degrees of euphoric effect on the people in this world, in that looking at these shades is likened to drug-usage:

Travis looked around for a moment, reached into his pocket and pulled out a silver swatch case. He snapped open the compact, took a deep gaze at the color hidden inside, then said, “Lime?”

I considered for a moment that he might be trying to trick me into an infraction so he could steam me for some merits, but he looked so lost and beaten and hungry that I decided he was genuine. Besides, I hadn’t green-peeked for months. Dad was quite strict about it, because he thought lime could lead to harder colors, but was realistic. “As soon as you’ve taken your Ishihara,” he had told me, “you can look at whatever you beiging well please.”

“Go on, then.”

Travis turned the compact toward me, and as my eyes fell upon the calming shade I felt my muscles relax and my anxieties about traveling to East Carmine fade away. Everything about the world suddenly seemed rather jolly ... But I was unused to peeking, and my head was suddenly full of Handel’s *Messiah*. (2009: 28)

The system of regularities and dispersion that rules the statements in these discursive formations regulates the production of the discourse in such a way that the narcotic quality of looking at green shades becomes apparent. One of the “harder colors” (2009: 94) that Eddie mentions is Lincoln, a highly regulated chromatic painkiller ten times more powerful than lime. The abuse of Lincoln could cause one to lose all sense of colour, natural and “univisual” (2009: 88). The discourse of drug abuse is apparent in several discursive instances. For example, drug users are referred to as “greeners” (2009: 94) instead of the contemporary slang “tweakers” that denotes those addicted to methamphetamines. The concept of “Chasing the Frog” (2009: 94) – as opposed to the contemporary phrase “chasing the dragon” that denotes the smoking heroin – is of particular interest because of its relation to the Green Room:

“Chasing the Frog” was what hardened greeners did when their cortex was too burned for even Lincoln to have an effect. They would go into the Green Room and partake of the color painted within – the shade of green that you saw only once in your life, when it was time to go. The color painted within the Green Room was known as “sweetdream” and would render you unconscious in twelve minutes and dead in sixteen, but during those twelve minutes every synapse in your brain would fire in a sparkling fountain of pleasure. The cries from the Green Room were never of pain or fear. They were of ecstasy. Chasing the Frog was a dangerous game. (2009: 94-95)

It is important that the reader is familiar with the existence and function of the Green Room because of its relation to a primary carceral mechanism in the text, namely “Mildew” or “the

Rot” (2009:19). This is a horribly gruesome affliction that causes spores of fungus to grow inside one’s body, leading to an excruciatingly painful death through asphyxiation in a matter of minutes. Mildew is known to the public as the number one killer and accordingly each town has its own Green Room to which a person can go willingly as soon as symptoms of the Mildew are discovered. This affliction is presented to the public as a disease to which anyone, no matter the hue, is susceptible. However, Eddie finally discovers that Mildew is not a disease, but a colour, passed surreptitiously to those who are considered dangerously subversive and who must thus be covertly eliminated. The extent to which Mildew is used as a disciplinary carceral mechanism is highlighted by its link to the towns of Rusty Hill and High Saffron. The entire town of Rusty Hill was been wiped out by Mildew four years previously. It is now under quarantine after the community attempted to restore a mural on the town hall ceiling that tells the story of “Munsell’s Epiphany” and the “Founding of the Collective” (2009: 140). Eddie and Jane believe that if the mural can be restored, they might be able to find out more about the “Something that Happened” and the nature of Munsell’s Epiphany. In essence, this means that the community of Rusty Hill came very close to discovering what cataclysmic event had occurred almost 500 years before, initiating the social reorganisation of humanity that introduced the system that adopted Munsell’s teachings – his “Epiphany” – as their social and political ideology. In order to prevent this discovery, the entire community was infected with Mildew and almost two thousand people died within 48 hours. Equally sinister is Eddie’s discovery that those who exhibit subversive tendencies are not sent to Emerald City to be Rebooted as the public believes, but rather to High Saffron where they are killed by the Mildew colour painted on its buildings. The mass of bones and spoons, the only items you are allowed to take with you on Reboot, provides evidence of the hundreds of thousands of people who have died in the streets of High Saffron.

Thus the Mildew is a diabolical disciplinary measure that ensures docility and maintains the longevity of the carceral nature of this society by killing individuals who exhibit deviant inclinations. The administration of Mildew can be considered a form of punishment and therefore “a technique for the coercion of individuals” (Foucault 1977: 131). It is the consequence of failing to conform to the norms of an established and disciplined society. Foucault observes that punishment trains bodies “by the traces it leaves, in the form of habits, in behaviour” and it presupposes “the setting up of a specific power for the administration of the penalty” (1977: 131). A fatal affliction such as Mildew forms part of the multiple power relations that dominate the entire social body, whether people are aware of it or not. Because

such a deadly affliction is administered to those who deviate from expected conduct, the dystopian nature of this society is highlighted.

As the discourse of the novel serves political interests in one way or another, it places the bodies of citizens in particular relations to power. Foucault stresses that “power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society” (1979: 93). This suggests that the social organisation, the focus on hierarchical status, the obsession with colour perception, the rigidity of the Rules, the encouragement of ignorance and naivety and the lethal consequences of non-conformity all form part of the various complex technologies that comprise the strategical state in Fforde’s society and also determine the rationality of its discourse. This complements Foucault’s assertion that power relations are entwined with various other kinds of relations. Because power is everywhere, knowledge cannot be isolated from power and what should be examined instead is what power produces. In dystopian settings such as Fforde’s, the exercise of power is focused on transforming bodies into disciplined citizens who can be passively coerced into docility.

The social organisation of Fforde’s society into a Colortocracy is its primary disciplinary method and its rules of conduct, named simply The Rules provide the “general formulas of domination” (Foucault 1977: 137). The Rules provide a set of rules of conduct that already presumes a series of dominations. They dictate the shared set of values presumed to guarantee successful communal life and are considered infallible:

The Word of Munsell was the Rules, and the Rules were the Words of Munsell. They regulated everything we did, and had brought peace to the Collective for nearly four centuries. They were sometimes very odd indeed: The banning of the number that lay between 72 and 74 was a case in point, and no one had ever fully explained why it was forbidden to count sheep, make any new spoons or use acronyms. But they were the Rules – and presumably for some very good reason, although what that might be was not entirely obvious. (2009: 29)

In contrast to the juridical or sovereign model of power that is principally hierarchical, Foucault’s view that power “takes the form of a ‘net-like’ series of relations” allows an understanding of how “specific mechanisms of power are invested in bodies as they are colonised, utilised, involuted, displaced, extended and so on, and how particular local mechanisms of power congeal into forms of ‘global domination’” (Barker 1998: 28-29). This

suggests that the Rules of the Collective are the very power mechanism that focuses on subjection and domination. Because the Rules are the Word of Munsell, they can be considered an ideological tool by which the colour-class system extends its domination over the citizens. *The Munsell Book of Wisdom* states: “Imaginative thought is to be discouraged. No good ever comes of it – don’t” (2009: 78). In this ideology, the Rules decree that books are part of the successive Great Leap Backward; knowledge pertaining to science, history, biography, geography, cookery, self-help, poetry, art and fiction that has been captured in books has been stripped entirely from society. This leaves citizens ignorant of crucial aspects of humanity that would grant them some nuance of independence or agency. Munsell’s ideology as part of the Rules as the law of the Collective is a carceral mechanism with the power to shape the thoughts of people through the discursive formations of the discourse of the Rules.

The discourse of the Rules ultimately regulates the conduct of Fforde’s society. Rule 5.2.02.02.018 states: “Yellows are permitted to break Rules in the pursuit of Rule-breakers, but all Rules to be broken must be logged beforehand, and countersigned by the Yellow prefect” (2009: 83). Despite the obvious irony inherent in this Rule, the result is that Yellows enjoy a certain privilege that grants them a sense of dominance over other citizens. This makes them the most detested group in their society as such power inevitably creates conceited and condescending individuals. However, because of their arrogance, Yellows represent the deeply embedded ideology of disciplined docile bodies, as they have the power to police conduct that is dictated by the truth-conditions of the Rules. When Holden and Eddie arrive at East Carmine, the Yellow arrivals monitor, Bunty McMustard, whose job it is to log all arrivals, reprimands Travis, ironically a fellow Yellow:

“With respect, ma’am,” we heard Travis say as they drew closer, “I’m not sure I fully understand how a poorly knotted tie can undermine the Collective.”

It was said in a sarcastic tone that the Yellow woman missed.

“A sloppy half-Windsor is the first symptom of serial indolence,” she replied in the patronizing voice that Yellows reserved for Rule-breakers, “and ignoring the infraction gives the impression that it is acceptable to be inappropriately attired. The next day it might be badly polished shoes, then uncouth language, showing off and impoliteness. Before one knows it, the rot of disharmony would start to disassemble everything that we know and cherish.” (2009: 39)

The discourse relating to propriety reveals the focus of the ideology of the Rule, which dictate that, by law, one should be appropriately dressed at all times, tidiness is mandated and rude language is forbidden. In addition to the text employing diction related to school disciplinary

figures such as prefects and monitors, the discursive formations of the Rules also relate to the discourse of the code of conduct of schools. As a result of this relation to the discourse of school conduct, Fforde's satire demonstrates the main Foucauldian techniques that uphold the realisation of disciplinary methods of the carceral institution. Firstly, Foucault states that "discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space" (1977: 141) that often requires enclosure or partitioning. In order to accomplish this "art of distribution", Fforde limits the movement of citizens in two very effective ways. In the first instance, because of the biology of people's eyes, citizens of the Collective are completely night-blind with the result that travelling after sunset is impossible. Each village is equipped with a Nightloss alarm that alerts the prefects when a person has not escaped the coming night in time. The prefects will then decide if it is worth the village resources to attempt a rescue, based on the status and worth of the lost resident. Those lost to the night are never found alive. Together with the night-blindness, people experience terrible night terrors once caught in the darkness:

And then I heard him. A series of short cries as the night terrors began to take hold. No one was immune. Not even the wisest prefect or sagest Colorman. We all knew what it was like – even indoors the absence of light has had an effect upon the senses that brought forth a multitude of terrifying apparitions. (2009: 119)

Because of the paralysing effects of night-time, night-blindness creates an enclosure that acts as a "protected place of disciplinary monotony" (Foucault 1977: 141). It can thus be postulated that the citizens of the Collective have no other choice but that of confinement to Chromatacia as a type of penitentiary; their night-blindness makes escape to the outside of whichever location they are in, impossible.

If the binary opposition structuring the text in terms of the distribution of individuals in space is that between sight and sightlessness, then in dystopian conventions sight will represent freedom and sightlessness will represent limitation. Since the narrative is from Eddie's perspective and therefore the reader's sympathies should lie with him, it can be deduced that the text privileges sight and therefore freedom because it highlights, by contrast, the lack of liberty that those like Eddie possess. However, if night-blindness is a disciplinary element aimed at controlling the distribution of individuals in space, conflicting evidence in the text shows the limitation of this ideology, revealing the undecidability of meaning. Firstly, the mere existence of blind people – known as "supernumeraries" – is problematic. According to the

public, once a person starts losing his sight, he contracts “Variant-B Mildew” (2009: 355). However, the truth is that blind people are *given* Mildew in order to eliminate those who are incapable of fearing the dark. Jane mentions that there are several supernumeraries hidden within the Greyzone, the section of East Carmine where Grey residents reside. Although hidden in attics, thereby limiting their freedom, because they are undiscovered by the authorities they never contract any form of Mildew and are capable of living full lives. Secondly, Jane reveals that there are individuals, including herself, who have the ability to see at night. She calls these people “Nightseers” and tells him that they are “above and beyond the Rules. The last line of defence against attacks upon the Munsell Doctrine” (2009: 344). It can thus be assumed, though not confirmed directly by the text, that it is these Nightseers who are the reason those lost at night are never found alive; they are the ones used to eliminate those who wander outside the designated enclosed space and too far from controllable special designations.

In deconstructive thinking, if sight represents freedom and sightlessness represents limitation and the text seems to promote the ideology of freedom, then there is certainly a limitation to the text’s promoted ideology. The mere existence of people who can function in darkness confirms that it is not darkness itself that restricts movement, but fear of the dark that is used as a barrier to restrict movement. Because the supernumeraries do not fear the darkness and are not limited by societal restrictions to conform to the Colortocracy, their sightlessness does grant them a certain sense of freedom. The same unstable opposition can be applied to the Nightseers, who have freedom to move about in darkness, yet their movements are still restricted because it is essential for their existence to remain a secret if fear of the dark is to be maintained as an effective disciplinary method.

A second element that restricts the movement of residents is the fact that travelling over great distances is extremely difficult. Because of Leapbacks, bicycles have been banned and automated vehicles are no longer manufactured. The result is that any existing vehicles are extremely old and belong to the village or town and are for the limited and regulated use of village business. There is no indication that people are aware of the existence of air travel, and in order to travel to other villages or towns on the train, they would have to be allocated an Open Return Ticket. This is only granted with permission from the village Prefect, however, and is expensive and very rare. Head Prefect deMauve tells Eddie,

“Travel is a very great privilege ... but can also lead to the spreading of disharmony, not to mention the Mildew.” (2009: 61)

Residents are likewise discouraged from relocating within the Collective, in order to save the postal service from descending into chaos. Travis explains to Eddie:

“Centuries of unregulated relocation have created a terrible burden. A letter might have to be redirected any number of times, as its mail route would have to follow not only your own but all your *ancestors*’ meanderings around the Collective ... If you, or an ancestor of yours, had lived in the same place more than once, the mail redirection service defaults to the earlier redirection and goes around again. Three-quarters of the postal service does nothing but move post that is stuck in perpetual redirection loops and is never delivered at all. But here’s the really stupid bit: The postal service’s operating parameters are enshrined in the Rules and can’t be changed, so Head Office reduced personal relocation in order to impose a lesser burden on the postal service.” (2009: 29)

The absurdity of the reason given for the discouragement of relocation satirically highlights the panoptic nature of Fforde’s society. By limiting the mobility of residents, the state (Head Office) is able to “establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals ... to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits” (Foucault 1977: 143). This suggests that disciplinary control is less difficult to realise because it is easier to oversee individual conduct in partitioned areas. In this way, delinquents can be easily identified and monitored as the aim is “not to retrain delinquents, to make them virtuous, but to regroup them within a clearly demarcated, card-indexed milieu which could serve as a tool for economic or political ends” (Foucault 1980: 42). When each individual has his place, conduct can be monitored and measured against the society’s norms so that deviant thoughts and any subversive energies can be identified and eliminated.

Foucault believes that what is important in allocating individuals to spaces is to assign individuals a rank or place in a classification. Using the educational space of a classroom as an example, he argues that “discipline is an art of rank, a technique for the transformation of arrangements” (1977: 145). This implies that while the real space dictates where an individual should be, the rank dictates to the individual what he/she is supposed to do while occupying not only the physical space, but also that particular hierarchical position within the rank. The rank distributes and circulates bodies in a network of power relations so that the educational space functions like a machine that supervises, categorises and rewards (Foucault 1977: 147).

Because the discourse of the Collective in Fforde's novel constitutes the discourse of educational institutions, it too functions like a machine that supervises, categorises and rewards. The credo of the Collective, "APART WE ARE TOGETHER" (2009: 73) emphasises this society's focus on the position of individuals in a hierarchy. As mentioned earlier, colour perception determines an individual's social status and thus the colour spectrum creates an ordered hierarchy that places individuals according to the importance of their rank. At breakfast in Vermillion, Eddie reflects:

I noticed also that despite the lack of any Rules regarding seat plans in "non-hue-specific" venues, the guests had unconsciously divided the room along strictly Chromatic lines. The one Ultraviolet was respectfully given a table all to himself, and several Greys stood at the door waiting patiently for an empty table even though there were places available. (2009: 3)

The discursive formations, in other words the connected and hierarchical transformations that illustrate the relations between statements, reveal the extent to which Eddie's society is disciplined to adhere to and accept the social practices that match individuals' hue, thereby categorising them according to their rank in the social hierarchy. Therefore, an individual's hierarchical position on the spectrum not only marks his rank but also indicates his value in society. In this way, although a Red may be at the bottom of the hierarchy in terms of his position, his value lies in his position as a primary colour who is able to produce offspring of the highest class, Purple, by marrying a Blue. Furthermore, it is possible for a lower-positioned colour to occupy a position of power above a higher-positioned colour. When a snobbish Green lady rudely orders Eddie to fetch her some marmalade, Eddie reflects:

We were three notches lower in the Chromatic scale, which officially meant we were subservient. But although lower in the Order, we were still Prime within the long-established Red-Yellow-Blue Color Model, and a Red would always have a place in the village Council, something the Greens, with their bastard Blue-Yellow status could never do. (2009: 3)

Here the class discourse reinforces Foucault's notion that the organisation of individuals in space works according to certain rules, in this case the social class system. While hierarchical power is determined by one's position in the series, it is possible for power relations to shift because of the nature and degree of one's colour perception. Thus, the rules that govern the ranking of individuals in the Collective are always aimed at maintaining the highest level of 'purity'. Only primary-coloured individuals may occupy a position on the village Council, only

individuals with over fifty percent perception are ranked as Chromogentsia, a class awarded certain privileges, and only individuals with a colour perception of his/her respective hue of over seventy percent may become a village Prefect. In this way, Foucault argues, hierarchical position ensures the obedience of individuals (1977: 148).

Fforde contrasts the ideological project of attaining Chromatic supremacy through arranged marriages with the character named Jabez, whose parents married not to improve the hue of their family, but because they were in love:

“Jabez is a *love child*. His parents married because – get this – *they couldn’t bear not to!* Weird, huh?”

Two other characters, Dorian, a Grey, and Imogen, an elite Purple who has more Blue than Red, make arrangements to elope because Imogen’s father plans to marry her off to a highly perceptive Red. This is in order to ensure stronger Purpled offspring, thereby solidifying their family’s upper-class status. As a result of this elopement plot, they are sent on the Night Train to High Saffron; unbeknown to them, they will be put to death there for daring to defy the established norm of marrying for hue, not love.

By deconstructing the binary opposition of freedom and limitation, the text presents, by contrast, the ideological limitation of this society’s concept of choice. Although people are allowed to choose who they want to marry, their choices are limited by social restrictions. Conversation between complementary colours is taboo as it is forbidden for complementary colours to marry. In addition, marrying for love is a strange notion as maintaining or advancing one’s family status is more highly valued for the attendant benefits it holds for one’s personal life. As one’s choice of life-partner has such a profound impact on one’s future, in the conventional sense and in the context of the novel, the concept of choice is somewhat redundant in a society where so many restrictions are placed on one’s freedom of choice.

The second Foucauldian technique that supports the realisation of disciplinary methods in Fforde’s novel is the strict control of residents’ activities and time. The most powerful mechanism of discipline in accomplishing such control, according to Foucault, is the timetable. Every individual in Fforde’s Collective is allocated a timetable that regulates how he spends his time. The purpose behind this practice is that every individual fulfils his fifty-year

obligation towards the Collective. Malingering is considered a waste of one's Civil Obligation, making it "village time theft" (2009: 93). A few days after Eddie arrives in East Carmine, Mr Turquoise brings him his timetable:

"... I'm responsible for career advice, organized glee, employment rosters and allocation of Useful Work. Can we walk and talk? I've got to check the inertia racer for Leapback Compliance... Here," said Turquoise, showing me my carefully prepared timetable.

"Sally Gamboge has raised the Grey retirement age to the maximum allowable, and is currently running sixteen-hour days, but we're still short a thousand person-hours a week, so the demands on Chromatic time are perhaps a little more than you might be used to. I daresay, in fact, that you might have to give up tennis or croquet, as there won't be time enough to do both."

"I quite understand the need for sacrifices, sir."

"Good fellow. I've got you down for Boundary Patrol first thing tomorrow, lightning watch on Saturday, anti-drowning supervision Mondays and Wednesdays and a turn teaching the juniors – this afternoon, in fact." (2009: 178)

Foucault argues that timetables are great disciplinary operations because they "transform the confused, useless or dangerous multitudes into ordered multiplicities" (1977: 148). By allocating certain activities that occupy an individual's time productively and according to the needs of the Collective, order is created and productivity increased. The timetable aims to establish a docility-utility relation in which individuals are occupied with activities in such a way that bodies can be utilised to meet the needs of the Collective and, more significantly, potentially dangerous subversive energies can be prevented from emerging. By regulating the most basic elements of a person's life – time and space – using a carceral mechanism such as a timetable, the way in which the residents of the Collective act and think will be regulated. Continuous regulation of behaviour and thoughts will result in desired thoughts and actions becoming mechanical and instinctive.

Fforde's society is a disciplined society because disciplinary power has successfully trained the bodies of residents into docility. In such a carceral society, official power depends on the ability to acquire information and gain knowledge of the activities of those who are dominated. Hierarchical surveillance is an effective way of gaining such knowledge as observation is a disciplinary practice that uses humanity's need to conform to the norm of expected and desired behaviour to coerce. Thus, observation itself is an operation of power; individuals change their behaviour without being physically or violently forced to do so. Because the social class system of the Colortocracy focuses on the effects of group psychology on the conduct of their entire

civilisation; it is essential that mechanisms are in place to ensure that individual impulses that fall outside the parameters of accepted social conduct are identified, monitored and suppressed. In a society in which high technology has been largely defaced or prohibited, the watchful power of the surveillance camera is not a possibility. Instead, this society ensures that surveillance is an automatic and permanent element incorporated in its social system. This, together with the focus on colour perception, creates a focus on visibility, giving the Collective its panoptic nature.

Various obligatory carceral mechanisms that promote visibility of one's hue and status have been established. Residents are required to wear a spot synthetically coloured with their hue of perception so that their colour class is clear to anyone with whom they come into contact. Eddie explains the importance of this obligatory identifying marker:

Wrongspotting was so rare as to be almost unheard of. It carried a thirty-thousand-merit fine – effective Reboot. You might as well put yourself on the Night Train and have done with it. (2009: 18)

Wrongspotting occurs when a person intentionally wears the incorrect colour spot to falsely identify as another hue. Satirically mirroring the school honours blazer, residents wear badges as visible signs of their conduct and achievements. These badges are satirically overt in their language and complement the discursive practices of school discourse, not only adding humour but also highlighting the values and ideology of this society. When Eddie's prank goes wrong, he is sent to East Carmine to conduct a chair census and obliged to wear a badge that reads NEEDS HUMILITY while he undergoes "Humility Realignment" (2009: 62). When he arrives in East Carmine, he is given a tour of the village by Tommo Cinnabar who wears an IMPERTINENT badge under his Red spot, together with LOW MERIT and HEAD JUNIOR MONITOR badges (2009: 72). Foucault observes, "He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power" (1977: 202). This suggests that by making certain aspects of an individual visible through markers such as a spot or a badge, the effects of power are passed on to those individuals in an attempt not only to identify but also to transform them. The display of these markers is a disciplinary carceral mechanism that "substitutes the uninterrupted play of calculated gazes" (Foucault 1997: 177). In other words, because each individual's markers can be seen by anyone at any time, the individual feels the invisible gaze of power exerted on him, through him and by him. The *possibility* that one might be watched is what disciplines an individual to conform to

regulations and exert control over his own conduct, thereby ensuring the automatic functioning of power.

Fforde's society uses unique methods to verify identification. Instead of the conventional identity number common in contemporary society, residents of the Collective have a postcode neatly carved onto their chests. As people pass away, their postcodes are reallocated to others. Some postcodes are passed on within a family and some are more prestigious than others. The allocation of a postcode is a momentous occasion akin to contemporary baptism. Together with your the postcode engraved on your chest, almost everything in this world, including animals, plants and root vegetables, have bar codes – not etched into them but growing out of them. People's bar codes grow from their nailbeds and the taxonomic reference to each organism is readable and contains some logic. Significantly, Eddie is particularly skilled at reading bar codes despite the fact that the purpose of these bar codes is still unknown. The librarian, Mrs Lapis Lazuli, has a theory that is interesting in this regard:

Her favoured theory was that the Previous performed periodic stock-takes and needed to know not only where all the stuff was but how much there was of it. This seemed likely, as the Previous were renowned for their desire to count things in order to control them. She also noted that some things had partial or “vestigial” codes, like the now-unreadable smudges on the necks of donkeys, and that a few things had no trace of a bar code at all: most notably bats, apples, bar codes themselves and rhododendrons. (2009: 231)

The discursive formations regarding the possible purpose of bar codes raises the reader's curiosity and prompts speculation as to how technology or genetic manipulation could have developed to make it possible for all organic life to sprout bar codes. If this was made possible through genetic engineering, what aspect of bats and apples was it that excluded them from this process? Whatever Fforde's reasoning, what can be safely deduced is that the presence of a genetically instilled means of identification and documentation of individuals' existence is certainly dystopian in nature; a carceral mechanism that controls by means of power-knowledge relations. As the bar code has been developed to identify and inventory products, and if an individual has such a bar code genetically imprinted on his person, it could imply that people of this society have been manufactured or genetically programmed in order for the authorities to have a readily available record of all their personal data. Whatever means used to scan and access these data bar codes would enable any authoritative power to gain access to all information required to exert power and control over the individual.

In addition to identifying markers, residents are required to carry their merit books on their person at all times. The merit books contain a complete record of their wealth, conduct and worth. Citizens can gain merits for good conduct or lose them for aberrant conduct. Merits have a monetary value and a distinguishing value; a person's merit tally can therefore grant one benefits or disadvantages. A thousand merits are required to gain full residency, which in turn gives one the right to marry, have seconds at dinner and wear a patterned waistcoat (2009: 67).

Together with a person's merit tally, the merit book also contains his colour perception, which is determined by a test known as your Ishihara, taken by all citizens at the age of twenty. The importance of this test cannot be understated:

Color perception was notoriously subjective, and the very human vagaries of deceit, hyperbole and self-delusion all conspired to make pre-test claims pretty much worthless. But all doubts came to nought the morning of your Ishihara. No one could cheat the Colorman and the color test. *What you got was what you were, forever.* Your life, career and social standing decided right there and then, and all worrisome life uncertainties eradicated forever. You knew who you were, what you would do, where you would go and what was expected of you. In return you simply accepted your position within the Colortocracy, and assiduously followed the Rulebook. Your life was mapped. And all in the time it takes to bake a tray of scones. (2009: 24)

The Ishihara test can be considered a form of examination and part of disciplinary training mechanisms. Foucault argues that the examination “is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish” (1977: 184). With this in mind, the result of the Ishihara test is a manifestation of a person's subjection to power as it objectifies individuals according to quantifiable and classifiable data. In this way it is possible to extract knowledge in order to differentiate, and judge individuals accordingly, when measured against the norms of their society. This is how, according to Foucauldian thinking, knowledge is converted into political investment (1977: 185). The discourse therefore indicates that the value of a person is quantifiable, based on the results of his/her Ishihara. No allowance is made for personal agency or personal merit based on acquired knowledge or skills or practised talent, which has a dehumanising effect on the human condition itself, emphasising a person's lack of worth in a dystopian carceral society.

Finally, the merit book contains the individual's feedback record. Whenever a person performs certain actions, those whom the action affects provide feedback thus recording evidence of how

well this person has performed his civic duties. Foucault argues that examinations are accompanied by “a system of intense registration and of documentary accumulation” (1997: 189). As a disciplinary mechanism of power, keeping records of conduct is a method of identification, signalling or description where the capacity, habits, tendencies, degree of conformity and the potential for deviance of each individual is registered.

By using the public gaze as observation instrument, an uninterrupted network of surveillance is created, which acts as “a machinery of control” and functions like “a microscope of conduct” (Foucault 1997: 173). Neighbours are expected and required to monitor the conduct of others, with the result that every individual is part of a perfectly controlled machine of regulated conduct. Eddie comments:

When Yellows start making inquiries, you never really know where it will end up. Not reporting something that happened was sometimes worse than the infraction itself. (2009: 55)

Reporting the conduct of others is a means of establishing discreet, intense and continuous supervision. In this way, “surveillance rests on individuals” and “holds the whole together and traverses it in its entirety with effects of power” (Foucault 1977: 176-7). This suggests that being observable and knowing that one is being observed disciplines individuals to practise self-policing. Such discipline makes it possible for the operation of relational power to sustain itself without force or violence.

Thus, the identifying markers, the merit books and the public gaze are carceral mechanisms that perform the function of hierarchical surveillance that trains citizens to conform to prescribed behavioural thoughts and conduct. Citizens are subjected to disciplinary power relations that dominate coercively, invisibly and without violent enforcement.

Foucault maintains that the “power of the Norm appears through the disciplines” and that the ‘normal’ “is established as a principle of coercion” (1997: 184). Norms require standardisation and therefore require imposed homogeneity. Normalisation masks the effects of power by training individuals to be efficient and to obediently conform to pre-existing standards. Moreover, “the normalised subject is the subject that also normalises others ... This is undertaken not by producing true statements about the world but by engaging in fundamental practices which constitute the domains in which true and false are able to operate” (Foucault

in Barker 1998: 66). In this way people can be policed and police others not because they are forced to do so, but because the norms of their society have conditioned them to believe in the truth conditions of the thoughts and actions linked to the norms. Fforde's society is carceral in nature because just like the penal system, it functions to reinforce social norms by "placing over the slightest illegality, the smallest irregularity, deviation or anomaly, the threat of delinquency" (Foucault 1977: 297). What is considered 'normal' thus provides the standardised measure of conduct by which otherness can be abolished; society can be conditioned to think, act and be the same in order to avoid the threat of delinquency.

A principal norm evident in Fforde's society is the promotion and maintenance of ignorance and stagnation. Day-to-day discourse includes the exchange of pleasantries amongst strangers such as wishing others a "joyously uneventful future" (2009: 5). Inquisitiveness is frowned upon and the norm is to keep your nose clean by adhering to the Rules without asking questions. The city of East Carmine, an area in the Outer Fringes of the known world, where most of the plot is set has a reputation of waywardness in this regard:

"The Outer Fringes have a reputation for being unsociably *dynamic* ... and some consider that eventfulness may lead to progressive thought, with all the attendant risks that might bring to the Stasis."

It was a diplomatically prescient remark, and one that I had cause to consider a lot over the coming days. (2009: 6)

Incorporated in the discourses of this society is the acceptance that any form of eventfulness will result in disorder and the collapse of civilised society. Indeed, the "eventfulness" that Eddie experiences throughout the novel is exactly what has encouraged his already inquisitive character to embrace the progressive thoughts of the delinquent. Ominously, early in the novel, Eddie's father warns him that "the inquisitive have a nasty habit of ending up in Reboot" (2009: 23). Progressive thoughts are considered very dangerous. There are various instances that illustrate that the reigning authoritative power is unyielding in its attempts to eliminate heterogeneous inclinations. Eddie's conversation with Travis Canary on the train to East Carmine reveals that radical predispositions have dire consequences. Travis explains to Eddie why he is being sent to Reboot:

"I used to work in the main sorting office in Cobalt. I attempted to circumvent the Rules with a loophole to stop redirections for long-deceased recipients. When that failed, I wrote to Head Office to complain. I got one of their 'your request is being considered'

form letters. Then another. After the sixth I gave up and set fire to three tons of undeliverable mail outside the post office.”

... “I suggested a better way to queue once,” I said in a lame attempt to show Travis he wasn’t the only one with radical tendencies, “a single line feeding multiple servers at lunch.”

“How did that go down?”

“Not very well. I was fined thirty merits for ‘insulting the simple purity of the queue’.” (2009: 29)

Later Eddie discovers that the real reason he was sent to East Carmine was not to conduct a chair census to realign his humility, but because his queuing initiative had flagged him as having deviant tendencies. In fact, the reason for East Carmine’s “unsocially *dynamic*” (2009: 6) reputation is that so many delinquents have ended up here. By flagging individuals with deviant tendencies and relocating them to an area close to High Saffron, where they will eventually be sent to be permanently removed from society, the authorities ensure that delinquents will be enclosed in the same space, making it easier to identify, monitor, study and control their delinquency.

In order to ensure that ignorance and stagnation is maintained in society, Head Office regularly initiates Leapbacks, administrative periods during which certain behaviour is proclaimed as prohibited or against the Rules. Significantly, these banned elements are those that not only ensure that people remain ignorant, but also inhibit any form of innovation. As reality is formed through and by discourse, regulations are placed on language itself: not only is crude language and swearing forbidden, but certain concepts are nullified as the words denoting those concepts have become obsolete. One of Eddie’s hobbies is to collect obsolete words, one of which is “commute”. Because the word is no longer in use, the implication is that the notion of travelling considerable distances, usually for work, has become incomprehensible to people – they do not understand the concept of commuting and will never be able to conceive of the possibility of travelling great distances regularly. The notion of banning words and concepts is carceral in nature as this type of control of discourse creates the ‘normal’ of the reality of the citizens. It suggests that it is normal not to be able to travel long distances regularly because there is no discourse to denote such a method of travel. The same applies to the concept of murder, which is so unusual in this society that their discursive formations are impacted. This is reflected in Eddie’s remark that “no one does the murder anymore” (2009: 130). This awkward grammatical structure illustrates how this society’s reality and language are intertwined in their discourse, as murder is something so unusual that it is difficult to conceptualise or articulate.

Two significant elements that are Leapbacked are books and history. By banning books and history, access to essential knowledge that might lead to enlightenment is impossible, simplifying the establishment of ignorance as the norm. Fforde aptly satirises this society's willingness to remain ignorant in his creation of the character the Apocryphal man:

The Rules, despite their vast complexity and extensive range, had no way of dealing with anything that had no explainable position within a world of ordered absolutes. So instead of attempting to understand or explain them, they were simply awarded the status of *Apocrypha* and stridently ignored lest they raise questions of fallibility. (2009: 44)

When he arrives in East Carmine, Eddie finds the Apocryphal man living in their house. Although the Rules mandate that all Apocrypha be ignored, those who are hungry for knowledge and have the courage to break the Rules and acknowledge his existence, pay the Apocryphal man with loganberry jam in exchange for answers to their questions. For some reason, the wise old man has been alive since the Previous. He was once a historian and in the years before history was Leapbacked, Head Office declared those studying society to be invisible by statute. However, when history was cancelled from society, he was not declared 'not invisible' and therefore remains an ignored historian continuing his work. The Apocryphal man is therefore an endless source of accumulated knowledge, acquired over decades of studying society without any of the limitations placed on the rest of society. „Because he does not exist, he can go anywhere, say anything, do anything with no fear of consequences because no one may admit openly that he is there. When Eddie buys three questions from the Apocryphal man with a jar of loganberry jam and asks him what happened to Robin Ochre, the swatchman who died and who Eddie's father replaced, the historian sheds some light on the carceral nature of the Collective:

“Careful,” he said, “information can liberate but also imprisonate. Ochre was skittering right on the edge of the Rules and drew attention to himself ... He had questions and I directed him toward the truth. But if you want answers in a world where hiding them is not only desirable but mandated, you have to take risks ... Be careful with all that dangerous *reason* ... The Collective abhors square pegs.” (2009: 209)

Foucault argues that “the carceral network, in its compact or disseminated forms, with its systems of insertion, distribution, surveillance, observation, has been the greatest support, in

modern society, of the normalizing power” (1977: 304). Thus the Apocryphal man’s discursive formations prove that remaining ignorant is a mandated norm in the carceral network of power relations functioning within Fforde’s carceral city. Moreover, because social conformity ultimately means conforming to the norm of ignorance, inquisitive individuals are regarded as ‘abnormal’ and dangerous in the sense that they jeopardise the longevity of the carceral nature of the Stasis. Because delinquents are not reformed at Reboot but killed by Mildew at High Saffron, a dystopian sense of malignant domination is created, the more so since most citizens are blissfully unaware of the fatal consequences of delinquency.

Eddie Russett is turned from conforming citizen to delinquent when he is sent away from his comfortably mundane life to the “unsocially dynamic” (2009: 6) town of East Carmine. Despite his natural curiosity, he initially accepts the ridiculous Rules and his place in society as a Red. He waits in anticipation for the Ishihara colour test that will map his life, determine his career and solidify his social standing. However, his attraction to and fascination with Jane G23 and her involvement with the wrongspotter whom Eddie and his father help in the Paint Shop awakens in him an inescapable yearning for enlightenment. Jane G23 stirs his innate curiosity and together these two delinquents question the accepted system and its carceral mechanisms.

Foucault claims that “there are no relations of power without resistances” (1980: 142). Because power circulates between bodies, individuals simultaneously exercise power while they experience its effects, thus becoming themselves the articulations of power (Foucault in Barker 1998: 28). Jane G23 is a delinquent not only because of her unconventional antisocial behaviour but also because of the extent to which she resists power. As a Grey she is part of the lowest class, but unconventionally does not “act her hue”. She is renowned in East Carmine for being impertinent, short-tempered and somewhat violent. She tore off Jabez Lemon-Skye’s eyebrow when he made a remark about her attractive nose, and tries to kill Eddie on several occasions before they fall in love and Eddie joins her in her revolutionary mission. Consequently, she has 800 negative merits and is up for Reboot the Monday after Eddie returns from his scouting assignment to High Saffron. She has no desire to conform to the social system of the Collective and her discourse makes it perfectly clear that she can only be forced to conform to a certain degree. Because she does not adhere to the restrictions of the social norms of the Collective, Jane possesses a certain sense of enlightenment because she has managed to gain knowledge about many aspects of their society that the hegemony wishes to keep hidden. She has knowledge about the technology of the Previous, she knows that there are people who

can see in the dark and she knows that people who have supposedly been re-educated at Emerald City when they are sent to Reboot are in fact sent to High Saffron to be killed by Mildew. Most importantly, Jane's deviant character is what makes her attractive to Eddie. Although she calls him one of the "unquestioning drones of the Collective" (2009: 110), it is Eddie's attempts to get closer to her that result in his own enlightenment; her unconventional thoughts and behaviour are an articulation of *her* effects of power.

The tension that Jane creates between notions of conforming and non-conforming thoughts, and the influence that this tension has on Eddie's own thinking, can be understood in the discursive formations of an enlightening conversation between them. Eddie thinks that Jane is against 'the Order' because she is at the bottom of the social hierarchy:

"There has to be some kind of hierarchy. The Purples aren't lofty and superior because they're Purple; it's because they're in power. You think Greys would be any different if the roles were reversed?"

"I don't want Greys in power any more than I want the Yellows. I just think that everyone should be equal ..."

"Equality is a proven myth," I remarked, the well-worn arguments tripping off my tongue. "Do you favour a return to the ways of the Previous with their destructive myopia and Worship of the Me? Or simply a descent into the anarchic savagery of the Riffraff?"

"Despite what you read in *Munsell*, those aren't the only choices. We deserve better than this. *All of us*. We could run the village like we run the Greyzone. No spots, no rankings, just people. Why do I have to prove myself an upright member of society and deserving of full residency before being allowed to marry? Why do I have to apply for an egg chit? Why can't I move to Cobalt if I wish? Why do I have to submit myself to any of the Rules?"

"Because *Something Happened*."

"What?"

There was no clear or easy answer to this.

"Something ... best forgotten. You may hate living under Munsell, but it has sustained for almost five centuries." (2009: 111)

Jane's utopian discourse expresses a desire for freedom and equality that is in contrast to Eddie's dystopian discourse. She expresses the necessity for society to embrace an alternative means of social organisation as a result of what happened in the past. However, Jane's discourse is privileged because of the effect that it has on Eddie's thoughts. It leads him to question many aspects of their society which are aimed at keeping people ignorant of actual events in the past. He questions why so many simple things like children's books and electric light bulbs have been deemed so dangerous that they will cause a damaging rift in society. He

wonders “what was so wrong with the telephone that it had to be withdrawn” or why there are no longer crinkle-cut chips, bicycles, kites or marzipan (2009: 111). Jane’s delinquency has a profound influence on Eddie, transforming his docile, conforming nature to dangerous deviance that threatens the credibility and longevity of the accepted normal of the Collective. This explains why disciplinary mechanisms have been put in place in their carceral society: delinquency poses resistance to the struggle for domination.

Eddie’s enlightenment reveals how strongly ignorance can be linked to incarceration. The people of this carceral society accept their colour-regulated way of life because they lack the knowledge to consider any alternatives. The dystopian nature of this oppressive notion is considered by Eddie once he discovers that there are such things as stars, “an obsolete word [that] sounded ancient to our ears” (2009: 227):

...I felt a thrill of discovery, of gained intelligence. But there was something else, too: an overwhelming sense of inconsolable *loss*. Progressive Leapbacks had stripped so much knowledge from the Collective that we were now not only ignorant, but had no idea *how* ignorant. The moving stars in the night sky were only one small part of a greater understanding that had gone for good. And as I stood there frowning to myself, I had a sense that everything about the collective was utterly and completely *wrong*. We should be dedicating our lives to *gaining* knowledge, not to losing it. (2009: 228)

Booker observes that denials of history and tradition “are quite common in dystopian fiction, where a lack of meaningful dialogue with the past often paradoxically plays an important role in the impoverishment of the present” (1994: 63). As Eddie begins to realise that ignorance is a disciplinary mechanism of power that locks the citizens of the Collective in their carceral city, he becomes the dystopian hero who is unwilling to be restricted by the normal, accepted state of ignorance that imprisons and oppresses. Moreover, he echoes our innate sentiment that losing any aspect of our humanity is not only wrong but also something that should never become the price we pay for establishing a better society.

The dystopian ideology of the carceral society of Fforde’s fascinating novel expresses the notion that incarceration can take many forms and it is often the case that ordinary people are unaware of their own lack of freedom. Foucault is correct in saying that power is coextensive with the social body, because it is the norm of conforming to social conventions that disciplines and coerces by minimising resistance. In this way, all societies are ultimately in danger of

becoming colourless carceral cities if the cost of utopia is not carefully considered and, perhaps more importantly, strongly resisted.

CHAPTER 4: VERONICA ROTH'S *DIVERGENT* TRILOGY

As discussed in Chapter 1, the pivotal point that Foucault highlights in *Discipline and Punish* is that although the panopticon is a prison design, it is essentially a model for examining a disciplinary society. He argues that "... panopticism is the discipline-mechanism ... that must improve the exercise of power by making it lighter, more rapid, more effective, a design of subtle coercion for a society to come" (1977: 209). A panoptic society, therefore, is a society in which disciplinary practices of observation and examination are in place and functioning optimally in order to coerce control subtly through normalising practises and not merely violent enforcement. Veronica Roth's *Divergent* trilogy, comprising *Divergent* (2011), *Insurgent* (2012) and *Allegiant* (2013), features just such a panoptic society, its main disciplinary practice being its faction system. The series forms part of the Young Adult (YA) dystopian genre that has been increasing in popularity since the late 2000s, even amongst adult readers, and the series has now been adapted to films which are now very popular.

With the exception of some of the chapters in the third novel, *Allegiant*, the series is told from the first-person perspective of sixteen-year-old Beatrice "Tris" Prior who lives in a society enclosed behind the gates of the futuristic dystopian city of Chicago. The societal structure is based on a system of five factions, Amity, Candor, Erudite, Abnegation and Dauntless. Each faction, as its name suggests, is a representation of a particular virtue valued highly by its community. Tris is born into the Abnegation faction, the faction that values selflessness. Like all the other sixteen-year-old teenagers in her society, Tris has to undergo an aptitude test to guide her in choosing the faction she will join at the Choosing Ceremony. Once an individual chooses a faction, that person must adopt the selected faction as his/her new family and must conform to the social conventions and customs of that community.

On the day of Tris's aptitude test, an examination that uses a substance known as simulation serum to determine which faction is most suited to one's personality, she finds that she is Divergent, the classification of those with a brain chemistry that fits not one single faction, but several factions. Her aptitude test reveals that she fits into Abnegation, Erudite or Dauntless. She chooses to transfer to Dauntless, the faction that values bravery above all else and that is responsible for training soldiers and security personnel. During her training, she meets and falls in love with an eighteen-year-old boy named Tobias, known as Four by the Dauntless, also an Abnegation transfer. Together they unravel a conspiracy that plans to eliminate all Divergent

citizens. They discover that the leader of Erudite, Jeanine Matthews, plans a coup to usurp power from the Abnegation government. In their efforts to thwart Jeanine's plans, they uncover a secret that has for many years been hidden from the general population by the Abnegation leaders. At the close of the second novel, *Insurgent*, Tris and Tobias find evidence left by Tris's relative, Edith Prior, in the form of a video. In this video, Edith Prior claims that people living in a faction-based society are meant to be a cure for the destruction and violence that emanates from human nature itself. The hope is that, left to develop separately from the rest of the world with new and effective social organisational strategies, this society will rediscover the essential moral values necessary to ensure a peaceful future. She believes that the gates enclosing the city should be unlocked forever once people with flexible minds, the Divergent, become "abundant" (Roth 2012: 524) in their society.

In the final novel, *Allegiant*, Tris and Four escape to the world outside the gates surrounding Chicago and make the shocking discovery that their way of life has been a human genetic experiment. They discover that the establishment of their enclosed city was the Bureau of Genetic Welfare's attempt to rectify a failed attempt to genetically eradicate those vices of humanity believed to be the source of conflict and war. In an attempt to "rediscover the moral sense most have lost" (Roth 2012: 524), the scientific community performed genetic experiments to eliminate the genes they believed responsible for man's violent and destructive behaviour. However, the experiment's negative mutations caused worse behaviour and a project was launched to identify and study people with a healed genome and eventually reintroduce these people back into the world. Those with brain chemistry different from the rest have healed genes and are identified as Divergent inside the city, but as Genetically Pure outside the city. Fighting through a series of attacks and betrayals, Tris and Tobias finally reveal the truth to their society and bring an end to a conflict that has claimed many lives.

Although the setting of Roth's trilogy does not initially appear nightmarish, its dystopian form is nevertheless present. Unlike typical utopian narratives that start with a visitor being guided through the utopian society in which he finds himself, Roth's trilogy is dystopian because it starts directly in the unfamiliar world, with information divulged to the reader in fragments by the narrator. The protagonist is already living inside the world and is immersed in the normality of its society's social and political structures. Although the first chapter reveals familiar elements that contemporary readers will not find strange, such as children riding their bikes to

school and parents going out to work, the opening paragraph reveals that the narrator's reality is not contemporary:

There is one mirror in my house. It is behind a sliding panel in the hallway upstairs. Our faction allows me to stand in front of it on the second day of every third month, the day my mother cuts my hair. (2011: 1)

This paragraph carries immense discursive power because it reveals the restrictive power of hegemonic order most common in dystopias. Limiting access to one's own reflection is unimaginable and strange, yet this control of something so small by an unseen and unknown authority exposes the dystopian nature of the text's narrative. Furthermore, not only do the discursive formations reveal the presence of hegemonic control that stems from a faction, they also reveal that the first-person narrator is young and her mother still cuts her hair. Thus, from the outset, the reader prepares him/herself to sympathise strongly with a young protagonist who is already functioning in a world where her smallest actions are strictly controlled.

Foucault claims that techniques of power and knowledge were initially cultivated in isolated institutions such as prisons, hospitals, factories and schools. These techniques are a "means of control or neutralization of dangerous social elements and evolved into techniques for enhancing the utility and productivity of those subjected to them" (Rouse 2005: 100). Isolated or enclosed institutions, such as Roth's dystopian Chicago, initially aim to establish or regain control after dangerous social elements, such as violent and destructive human behaviour, have been identified, and then attempt to neutralise such dangerous elements. At the same time, these power/knowledge techniques increase the efficacy and efficiency of those who are subjected to living within such an institution. The faction system of this society that is enclosed within the gates of a futuristic Chicago can thus certainly be considered the primary mechanism of power and knowledge in Roth's novels.

Before the true rationale behind the formation of the faction system is revealed in the last novel, it is initially believed that in their creation of the five factions, the city's ancestors attempted to eradicate the negative traits in human personality that are responsible for violent behaviour that leads to war. Thus, the Amity faction values peace and kindness in order to eradicate aggression; the Erudite faction values knowledge and intelligence in order to eradicate ignorance; the Candor faction values honesty in order to eradicate duplicity; the Abnegation faction values selflessness and humility in order to eradicate selfishness; and the Dauntless

faction values courage in order to eradicate cowardice. Added to this, we are told that this way of life has guaranteed peace for many decades. Marcus, the political leader of Abnegation and Tobias's abusive father, has this to say about the initial purpose of the faction system:

“Decades ago our ancestors realized that it is not political ideology, religious belief, race, or nationalism that is to blame for a warring world. Rather, they determined that it was the fault of human personality – of humankind's inclination towards evil, in whatever form that is. They divided into factions that sought to eradicate those qualities they believed responsible for the world's disarray.” (2011: 42)

The faction system in itself is thus instituted as a “means of control or neutralization of dangerous social elements” (Rouse 2005: 100); in the case of this society, dangerous human vices. Furthermore, Marcus elaborates on how efficacy and efficiency is increased by means of the faction system:

“Working together, these five factions have lived in peace for many years, each contributing to a different sector of society... In our factions, we find meaning, we find purpose, we find life... Apart from them, we would not survive.” (2011: 43)

This society has therefore used the values of their faction system as “techniques for enhancing the utility and productivity” (Rouse 2005: 100) of its citizens. By correctly training citizens to conform to the norms of their factions, docility is accomplished and citizens are useful in their contributions to their society. Foucault argues that a “body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved” (1977: 136). This suggests that the faction system has been created as a means of transforming and improving the identity of people in order to use their bodies to meet the needs of the society. When the bodies of citizens are transformed so that they can be used optimally to improve not only a society, but perhaps humanity in general, the result is a disciplinary society in a carceral city.

Because the dystopian text “is built around the construction of a narrative of the hegemonic order and counter-narrative of resistance” (Seeds in Baccolini & Moylan 2003: 5), Roth's trilogy presents a detailed and pessimistic possibility of an imaginable social alternative that is oppressive in nature. Levitas and Sargisson suggest that the “transformation of ways of thinking and of being ... depends on an alternative structure within which another logic of action and understanding makes sense” (2003: 19). It could be argued that the formation of a value-driven faction-based social system is just such an alternative structure. Yet if one

considers that alternative social arrangements are explored in the utopian/dystopian narratives as a means to imagine ways to eradicate the “alienation, repression, competition and separation from each other” (Levitas & Sargisson 2003: 13) experienced in contemporary society as these scholars suggest, the faction system proves to be a failed alternative. Many characters continue to feel alienated once they transfer to another faction; repression is dominant from the opening of the first novel and continues throughout the trilogy. Competition in the Dauntless rankings results in one initiate being stabbed in the eye, another committing suicide, and separation is a built-in function of the faction system, where factions operate separately from one another.

The true reason for the introduction of the faction system as the new social order is revealed to be more complicated in the third novel. In an attempt to improve humanity and eradicate violent tendencies, genetic engineers altered certain genes in genetic manipulation experiments. Genetic predisposition to qualities such as cowardice, selfishness and dishonesty were believed to have ultimately contributed to a broken society. The attempt to heal a broken society through genetic engineering came at a terrible cost, however, as these genetic alterations had dreadful, unforeseen consequences. In eliminating fear, low intelligence and dishonesty, compassion has been lost; by eliminating selfishness, the sense of self-preservation was lost. Individuals with altered genes – “the Genetically Damaged” (GDs) (2009: 248) – waged a civil war against the government and those with unaltered genes – “the Genetically Pure” (GPs) (2009: 248) – in the Purity War, a cataclysmic event that wiped out more than half of the population of the world. Genetic damage and not human nature was blamed for this war and the Bureau of Genetic Welfare was formed to solve the “genetic problem” (2009: 124). This organisation reasoned that because society had failed to alter human nature genetically, it should introduce the “nurture element” (2009: 125) to their behavioural modification project. The faction system was therefore introduced by city experiments designed to harbour people with damaged genes so that desirable qualities could be nurtured while time would, it was hoped, heal their damaged genes.

In order to ensure the success of the faction system as behavioural modification method to correct the disastrous effect of failed genetic engineering, each faction has been provided with its own serum, developed by scientists of Erudite. Genetic engineering and chemically induced simulations created by these serums are aspects of this trilogy that are common to science fiction novels. Roth’s serums are a very simple application of cognitive estrangement as she uses a familiar concept: a serum, a clear liquid that can be injected into blood, that she

makes new by adding another familiar concept, truth, to qualify it. Thus, in the *Divergent* trilogy, various serums are used for various purposes. Some serums are liquids containing transmitters that are injected into the body to induce hallucinations known as simulations. These transmitters send signals to a computer and then monitors and records the information received. Other serums are taken orally, such as the simulation serum taken for the aptitude test, and in one case, an aerosol version of a serum to be inhaled is created. Each faction has its own serum for use on its members only. The Amity incorporates a peace serum into its members' food in order to keep them passive enough to be instinctively peaceful at all times. Candor uses its truth serum on its initiates to ensure that they openly reveal their deepest secrets, thereby proving their commitment to upholding the quality of honesty. The Abnegation memory serum is intended to modify or wipe out the memories of those who obtain knowledge about the true purpose of the city, or those who enter the city willingly to become part of the experiment. The Dauntless use their fear serum to simulate what they call their "fear landscapes", a simulation that forces initiates to confront their deepest fears in order to learn that true courage lies not overcoming fear but in learning to act in the midst of fear. The Erudite have developed a death serum as a lethal security measure, and have also modified the Dauntless fear serum into an attack simulation serum, used to organise the Dauntless soldiers to attack and murder the Abnegation.

There are many ways in which Roth's societal structures differ from those of Huxley and Fforde. However, these differences may highlight and strengthen the argument that carceral systems are as present in dystopian worlds as they are in "cloister, prison, school, regiment" (Foucault 1977: 293). This society is stratified not by birth, but by choice. The importance of this choice is highlighted by the slogan "Faction over blood" (2009: 43) that is repeated throughout the novels. The virtue that your chosen faction embraces becomes the single virtue that drives the faction members' thoughts and actions. Conforming to the norms of your chosen faction is crucial as failure to do so means becoming factionless, a fate considered worse than death.

Obligatory social conformity in Roth's carceral city is the primary carceral mechanism that creates disciplined and docile bodies. This is portrayed in the behavioural restrictions and customs of all the factions, but is particularly prominent in the Abnegation faction. In order to condition selfless living, Abnegation's customs involve discouraging any behaviour that may promote the individual self. Members of this faction are required to dress in plain grey clothing,

live in plain houses and eat plain food. Their demeanour should be quiet and reserved and physical contact should be limited, earning them the derogatory nickname “Stiff”. Most interesting is their encouragement of sameness:

The people I pass probably can’t tell us apart. We wear the same clothes and we wear our blond hair the same way. (2011: 11)

We set an example for our fellow faction members, and soon the three of us are engulfed in the mass of grey fabric ascending cement stairs in the half light. I settle into their pace. The uniform pounding of feet in my ears and the homogeneity of the people around me makes me believe that I could choose this. I could be subsumed into Abnegation’s hive mind, projecting always outward. (2011: 39)

The discourse reveals the “bodily rhetoric” of disciplined docile bodies that is akin to that of soldiers “who could be recognized from afar” and who “bore certain signs” (Foucault 1977: 135). Thus, as faction customs dictate people’s movements, gestures and attitudes, even one’s idle behaviour, control is accomplished through power over the active body. The body becomes economical in the sense that it becomes usefully docile; conflicting modes of thinking will no longer be possible. The result is a degree of discipline that makes adherence to established faction customs instinctive; Abnegation faction members all become part of a hive, functioning as one.

Because the protagonist transfers from the Abnegation to the Dauntless faction early in the first novel, much attention is given to Dauntless conduct and customs. The Dauntless compound and its “uniform” of black clothes, tattoos and piercings are of particular interest as its resemblance to a prison is uncanny and ironic, as the Dauntless are trained as the city’s security force. In stark contrast to the Abnegation, the Dauntless are wild-mannered and gregarious. Known as thrill-seekers, the Dauntless seek any opportunity to be as daring as possible and to prove their bravery, no matter how dangerous the situation. This includes jumping to and from a moving train, zip-lining from a hundred-storey building or shooting muffins from a friend’s head. The description of the main living area for Dauntless residents is particularly interesting:

“Pit” is the best word for it. It is an underground cavern so huge I can’t see the other end of it from where I stand, at the bottom. Uneven rock walls rise several stories above my head. Built into the stone walls are places for food, clothing supplies, leisure activities. Narrow paths and steps carved from rock connect them. There are no barriers to keep people from falling over the side. (2011: 63)

Foucault describes the military camp as “the short-lived, artificial city, built and reshaped almost at will” (1977: 171). The Dauntless Pit bears a striking resemblance to such a military camp, yet it is exaggerated to highlight Dauntless values. The compound also includes a chasm and a ravine with a dangerous river flowing along one side of the Pit. The Dauntless are therefore exposed to an environment that is constantly dangerous and, like a panoptic prison, allows for very little privacy.

Foucault remarks that “discipline is a political anatomy of detail” (1977: 139), which suggests that every minute requirement of conduct contains a political awareness through the use of various carceral techniques to control and use the members of society. Firstly, “discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space” (Foucault 1977: 141) by placing them in enclosed, partitioned and functional locations and allocating them to a place in a series, giving them a rank. As mentioned above, Roth’s future city of Chicago is indeed an enclosed city which removes it from the structural relationships of the society outside its gates. It has its own rules, social and political structures, limitations and expectations, all of which allow social norms and customs to develop independently. In this way, discipline is accomplished easily and effectively.

The city itself is also partitioned, with the five factions and the factionless located in different sections of the city, each occupying its own physical space. Foucault argues that “disciplinary space tends to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed” (Foucault 1977: 143). This suggests that placing faction members in the same physical space, while keeping the factions separate allows for the carceral mechanisms to be more effective. For example, the Abnegation sector is located close to the factionless sector because an additional duty of the Abnegation, apart from providing selfless leaders in government, is to distribute food and resources to the factionless who live in poverty and squalor. The Amity compound, on the other hand, is located on the edge of the city as the Amity are responsible for growing food for the entire city and need the agricultural space for orchards and farms.

Lastly, each faction has its own methods of ranking members in order to assign them to a position that corresponds to the function of that individual and his/her contributing value. Roth elaborates mostly on the Dauntless ranking system and the privileged position of the GPs in the last novel. Foucault argues that “distribution according to ranks or grade has a double role: it marks the gaps, hierarchizes qualities, skills and aptitudes; but it also punishes and rewards”

(1977:181). In the Dauntless faction, in order to mark the gaps and hierarchise qualities, individuals are classified as either initiates or members. Initiates are then grouped as either Dauntless-born or transfers and are trained separately by different Dauntless trainers. During training, initiates are ranked according to their performance during the three stages of initiation. In order to address reward and punishment, only the top ten initiates in the ranking receive membership; the remaining initiates are required to leave the Dauntless compound and join the factionless. An individual's ranking will also determine which career he/she is allowed to choose: the higher one's ranking, the more prestigious one's career options. Only the top ranked members are allowed to become Dauntless leaders.

Foucault argues that in order to establish a disciplined society, docile bodies must be created by means of correct training: the "success of disciplinary power derives no doubt from the use of simple instruments; hierarchical observation, normalizing judgement and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination" (1977: 170). Tris's experience as a Dauntless initiate, training to become a full Dauntless faction member, demonstrates the entire process of such training.

Foucault observes that the "exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation" (1977: 170), suggesting that the effects of power are induced by visibility. One of the aspects that places this trilogy in the dystopian genre is that "the inhabitants of the community are manipulated by its leaders without their knowledge, let alone their consent" (Sargent 2003: 229). The people inside the carceral city of a futuristic Chicago have become disciplined docile bodies without the knowledge that Tris and Tobias gain outside the city; they have been observed by the Dauntless security cameras belonging to the Bureau of Genetic Welfare. For the city inhabitants, observation occurs through apparently less malevolent forces. Foucault talks of "minor techniques of multiple and intersecting observations, of eyes that must see without being seen; using techniques of subjection and methods of exploitation" (1977: 171). Faction members' conduct is monitored by such intersecting observational techniques, willingly and unwillingly. One such technique is the force of simple peer pressure to conform to the norms of one's faction. Members of all factions are under constant pressure to exhibit exemplary conduct, suitable to instituted faction values and standards. The purpose of this conforming to the social regulatory standards of a faction is to instil social identity in individuals so that their place in society is created and defined solely by their own faction. Added to this, by belonging to a faction and being accepted by other

members of the faction as one of their own, individuals develop identity and meaning in relation to how they differ from other factions. For example, Roth makes it clear from the opening of the first novel that there has always been enmity between the Abnegation and Erudite factions: Abnegation has the power that the Erudite covet, with the implication that their valuing of knowledge is equated to a hunger for power. Thus, when an Erudite member voices disapproval or animosity towards the workings of the Abnegation, that member gains considerable social acceptance in the Erudite faction.

A further observational method of subjection and exploitation is the faction leaders' use of serums. As mentioned earlier, each faction has its own serum to assist its authorities in maintaining faction norms. The Candor, who value honesty, place its initiates under truth serum with the argument that if a person openly reveals his/her deepest secrets, being honest about everything else will be effortless. However noble the Candor faction's intentions are in using their truth serum to uphold the virtue of honesty, the text reveals the dangers of the existence and use of such a serum when it is forced on captives as an aid in interrogation. This creates the binary that contrasts freedom and restraint and, because the text is dystopian, it inherently privileges freedom. Thus although the Candor initiates choose to join the faction that values honesty knowing full well that they will be forced to be truthful at all times for the rest of their lives, other factions' members do not make that choice. Enforcing the truth limits individuals' freedom to choose what to say, yet in both cases, as initiate or as captive, the *différance* can be found in the truth serum's power to remove the freedom to choose to be truthful or not.

As far as the freedom to choose is concerned, it is also important to consider here that although citizens of this carceral city are provided with choice as to which faction to join, the limitations and the consequences of this choice are what bring Roth's social criticism to light. Firstly, an individual has no choice but to choose from a limited number of predetermined factions – it is part of their way of life. Secondly, initiates are not aware that their choice does not guarantee them membership until after their choosing ceremony. The Dauntless, for example, only grant membership to the top ten ranked initiates. Lastly, the only alternative to joining a faction is societal rejection and suffering as a factionless being.

The Dauntless simulation serum is an even more powerful observational method of subjection and exploitation. In the first instance, it is used to administer the compulsory aptitude test that all sixteen-year-olds are required to take before they choose which faction they wish to join.

This aptitude test can be regarded as part of the training process that produces docile bodies in a disciplined society. Foucault observes that “the examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgement” (1977: 184). During the testing process, the participant is observed to elicit information on how that participant responds to situations. This response is then measured against the norms set by faction doctrine. Tori, the Dauntless woman who administers Tris’s aptitude test, explains:

“Typically, each stage of the simulation eliminates one or more of the factions, but in your case, only two have been ruled out ... If you had shown an automatic distaste for the knife and selected the cheese, the simulation would have led you to a different scenario that confirmed your aptitude for Amity. That didn’t happen, which is why Amity is out ... Normally, the simulation progresses in a linear fashion, isolating one faction by ruling out the rest. The choices you made didn’t even allow Candor, the next possibility, to be ruled out, so I had to alter the simulation to put you on the bus. And there your insistence upon dishonesty ruled out Candor ... On the one hand, you threw yourself on the dog rather than let it attack the little girl, which is an Abnegation-oriented response ... but on the other, when the man told you that the truth would save him, you still refused to tell it. Not an Abnegation-oriented response ... Not running from the dog suggests Dauntless, but so does taking the knife, which you didn’t do.”

Foucault claims that “in all the mechanisms of discipline, the examination is highly ritualized” (1977: 184). This suggests that any form of test or information-gathering process has particular strategies and methods specifically designed to meet the goals of that examination. In the case of Tris’s aptitude test, the examination comprises challenges intended to identify certain character traits. The aptitude test simulates various scenarios during which participants have to make choices. Those choices are then measured against the cultural norms of the factions, thereby determining, according to the choices made, which defining characteristic the participant possesses and establishing which particular faction the participant’s character favours. Although teenagers are not obligated to join the faction for which they show aptitude, the test is nonetheless designed to reveal which faction he/she is more suited to in order to be the most use to society. Foucault maintains that the examination combines the “ceremony of power and the form of the experiment, the deployment of force and the establishment of truth” (1977: 184). In other words, the power and knowledge relations involved in the examination are imposed on those who undergo the examination, forcing them to comply with the inherent standards of the hegemony. Tris’s society is a culture that embraces fixed identity and assumes individuals can only be categorised into one of the five factions. Her aptitude test results identify her character as one that deviates from societal norms. Thus her Divergent identity

suggests subversive potential, complicating the fact that her aptitude test is observed and recorded. Tori explains:

“Beatrice,” she says, “under no circumstances should you share that information with anyone. This is very important.”

“We aren’t supposed to share our results.” I nod. “I know that.”

“No.” Tori kneels next to the chair now and places her arms on the armrest. Our faces are inches apart. “This is different. I don’t mean you shouldn’t share them now; I mean you should never share them with anyone, *ever*, no matter what happens. Divergence is extremely dangerous. You understand?” (2011: 22-23)

In order to protect Tris, Tori deletes her results and reports them verbally, claiming to her superiors that something went wrong with the test. Observation as an operation of power is thus in this case revealed as a malignant force as it occurs within the parameters of dystopian discourse. Within these parameters, because observation permits “an internal, articulated and detailed control” (Foucault 1977: 172), being observable – especially under circumstances over which one has no control, such as being part of a chemically induced simulation – becomes a very strong and prominent controlling carceral mechanism in a panoptic dystopian society. Even before the reader knows why this information is dangerous and from whom the danger is likely to come, it will be assumed that whoever the observer of the aptitude test simulation data is will probably take the form of a malevolent authority as this is the dominant form of authority in dystopian settings. The aptitude test can therefore be viewed as a malevolent carceral mechanism of the panopticon: the person taking the test “is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication” (Foucault 1977: 200).

The second case in which the Dauntless simulation serum is used as observational method of subjection and exploitation is during Dauntless training. The visibility of the results produced by the Dauntless serum, used to simulate the fear landscape of their initiates, is as ominous as in the case of the aptitude test. In the second stage of Dauntless initiation, initiates are given the simulation serum to induce their worst fears. The simulation ends only once initiates slow their heart rates and breathing or do something to confront their fear. Initiates are ranked according to the time it takes them to complete the simulation. Considering that in stage three they are required to face all of their fears, this is a particularly gruesome test as most initiates have between ten and fifteen fears and are only teenagers. Tobias is famous for having only four fears, earning him the nickname Four, and Tris only faces six fears in her final examination fear landscape. The process and results of the Dauntless initiation are important because

“testing emphasizes the battle of individuals for access to limited resources and opportunities” (Alexander & Black: 2015: 213). Once initiates have completed their training, having passed all three stages of examination, and are ranked according to their performance, they are deemed qualified to serve the interests of the faction by entering its community as part of its productive workforce.

As in the aptitude test, Tris’s divergence, and the danger of being known as Divergent, is revealed when she manipulates a simulation of one of her fears. Tobias says:

“You manipulated the simulation: you’re Divergent. I’ll delete the footage, but unless you want to wind up *dead* at the bottom of the chasm, you’ll figure out how to hide it during the simulations!” (2011: 255)

Foucault states that “surveillance may not be one of the great technical ‘inventions’ of the eighteenth century, but its insidious extension owed its importance to the mechanisms of power that it brought with it” (1977: 176). Tobias’s discursive formations reveal such an insidious extension, as the consequences of being observed as deviant from the rest of society could be, and have been in the past, lethal. The mechanism of power that makes surveillance insidious in this case is the fact that the antagonist, the Erudite leader Jeanine Matthews, has access to the simulation results and uses them to eliminate all people who are able to manipulate these simulations. Her plan to overthrow the Abnegation government is dependent on controlling and using the Dauntless soldiers by means of simulations; anyone who is immune to being controlled by her simulation serum is a threat to that plan. Being observable by a dangerous antagonist such as Jeanine Matthews is a carceral mechanism that has a transforming power because Tris is forced to self-police her conduct and modify her behaviour in her simulations in order to hide her divergence.

Although the citizens of Chicago are well aware that the city is monitored by Dauntless security cameras, the observational power of the presence of cameras does not coerce citizens into conforming behaviour. In fact, coercing conforming behaviour is not the function of the security cameras. In the last novel, *David*, the leader of the Bureau of Genetic Welfare, reveals the following to Tris and Tobias:

“You’ve always known that the Dauntless observe the city with security cameras ... Well, we have access to those cameras too.” (2013: 128)

However, the text deconstructs itself when David says,

“We have gone to great lengths to protect you, observe you, and learn from you ... and contrary to what Edith Prior said, we never really intended for you to send a Divergent army out to us. We don’t after all, truly need your help. We just need your healed genes to remain intact and to be passed on to future generations.” (2013: 126)

David’s discourse is truly shocking to the main characters and indeed to the reader as well. If all that was needed was for the healed genes to be passed on down the generations, it seems unnecessary for the Bureau to go to such great lengths to observe citizens’ experiments in order to “protect” and “learn from” them. Observation in order to protect suggests keeping the citizens safe, which the Bureau did not do if one considers the Divergent murders over the years and the civil war in the city. Observation in order to learn from citizens without requiring the information gained to cure the damaged genes effectively dehumanises the citizens; they become unknowing participants in an experiment not aimed at improving human life, but at satisfying the curiosity of the observers.

Roth’s novels thus demonstrate that surveillance through various observational techniques makes it possible for disciplinary power to become “an ‘integrated’ system, linked from the inside to the economy and to the aims of the mechanism in which it was practised” (Foucault 1977: 176). The faction system itself, with all its carceral mechanisms of observation, ingrains the necessity of conforming to the social norms of each faction, as instituted by the Bureau, into people’s identities. Hierarchised surveillance contributes to the creation and sustaining of a disciplined society because “discipline makes possible the operation of a relational power that sustains itself by its own mechanism” (Foucault 1977: 177). This suggests that the carceral mechanisms of the faction system make it possible for citizens to be oblivious of insidious dominant power structures that sustain themselves through the relational power that stems from the obligatory social conformity that is embedded within this system.

The investigation of each faction, its values and its citizens, according to the binary of virtue and vice reveals the undecidability of the notion of embracing a single value as one’s ideology. While the novel presents a society in which it is possible to live according to a single moral value, at the same time it deconstructs itself through the conflicts that arise not only within this society, but also among individuals. In *Allegiant*, the text reveals that, through the gene

manipulation process, GDs gained not only the virtues embraced by the factions, but also depending on the individual and his/her personality and circumstances, an opposing vice. The Dauntless, though conditioned to be brave by their training to overcome fear, tend to be cruel. The Erudite, the intelligent scientists, researchers and inventors, have a tendency to be arrogant and vain. The Amity, a kind and peace-loving community of counsellors and caretakers who cultivate the city's food, are passive and uninvolved in any form of conflict. The Candor, conditioned to be honest at all times, are consequently inconsiderate and tactless in their conduct. Finally, the Abnegation, whose devotion to selflessness provides the city with incorruptible leaders in government, are overly reserved and lack a sense of self-preservation. This ultimately contributes to the annihilation of the vast majority of its population.

Jacobs argues that "difference may represent a threat to the unified humanist subject, who is defined in and exercises agency through opposition to some Other" (2003: 94). In Roth's trilogy, "the unified humanist subject" is represented by the 'normal' conforming faction members of society. On the other hand, characters who represent the Other are different in the sense that they find embracing singular thinking and sameness an impossibility. Others fail in the process of conforming to the norms of faction culture during their initiation period. These characters could be regarded as the delinquents of Roth's carceral city. A delinquent, according to Foucault, is an individual who displays abnormal behavioural patterns and thinking and whose personality itself is the offence (1977: 253). Delinquency is defined in terms of norms, not laws, and the delinquent is an individual who commits an offence against the norms. He is set apart from the rest of society as 'the other' and in a dystopian setting he is a symbolic representation of the failure to conform. Foucault considers delinquency a politically and economically less dangerous form of illegality that can be separated from other offences, because it is possible to identify, monitor, study and control delinquency as such individuals form only a small group of society. This notion of delinquency is illustrated when Tobias and Tris are captured as divergent rebels by Jeanine Matthews's forces at the end of the first novel:

"You," she says, pointing at me, "I expected. All the trouble with your aptitude test results made me suspicious from the beginning. But you ... Tobias – or should I call you Four? – managed to elude me ... Everything about you checked out: test results, initiation simulations, everything. But here you are nonetheless ... Perhaps you could explain to me how that is?"

"You're the genius," he says coolly. "Why don't you tell me?"

Her mouth curls into a smile. "My theory is that you really do belong in Abnegation. That your Divergence is weaker."

...

“Now that your intelligence has been verified, you might want to get on with killing us.” Tobias closes his eyes. “You have a lot of Abnegation leaders to murder, after all.”

...

“Don’t be silly. There is no rush,” she says lightly. “You are both here for an extremely important purpose. You see, it perplexed me that the Divergent were immune to the serum that I developed, so I have been working to remedy that. I thought I might have, with the last batch, but as you know, I was wrong. Luckily I have another batch to test ... I created a new serum that will adjust your surroundings to manipulate your will. Those who refuse to accept our leadership must be closely monitored ... You will be the first test subject, Tobias.” (2011: 427-432)

Because Jeanine Matthews represents the antagonistic dystopian hegemony in the first and second novel of Roth’s trilogy, the discursive formations in this conversation reveal the carceral nature of the operations of power in the carceral futuristic Chicago. It confirms that information is collected from all the tests and simulations with the goal of eliminating any delinquency. Once it has been determined that an individual is not controllable by means of existing control mechanisms, the exercise of power is adapted to not monitoring delinquents, but simply robbing them of their free will. All these elements combine form the disciplinary mechanisms of a carceral society. The emphasis of homogeneity and subtle coercion by means of faction norms, together with surveillance, testing and control of agency consequently produces the ultimate form of domination.

In Roth’s trilogy, delinquency is represented firstly by the concept of being factionless. Tris reflects:

What if they tell me that I’m not cut out for any faction? I would have to live on the streets, with the factionless. I can’t do that. To live factionless is not just to live in poverty and discomfort; it is to live divorced from society, separated from the most important thing in life: community.

My mother told me once that we can’t survive alone, but even if we could, we wouldn’t want to. Without a faction, we have no purpose and no reason to live. (2011: 20)

The threat of becoming factionless is the threat of delinquency because it entails becoming that which does not belong in a disciplined society. At this point in the narrative, Tris believes that being factionless entails suffering and isolation. Thus, the threat of becoming factionless is a carceral mechanism because faction life is of the utmost importance in this culture. Conforming to a faction is necessary for survival because it guarantees enviable employment. The

factionless may only perform low-paying and undesirable work that no one else wants to do and are dependent on donations from the Abnegation for survival. The discursive formations in the above extract also reveal that conforming to a faction is desirable because it gives an individual a sense of purpose in that he/she is contributing towards the overall good of society.

It is important to note that the factionless make up the majority of Divergent. This makes sense as “those who can’t confine themselves to a particular way of thinking would be most likely to leave a faction or fail its initiation” (Roth 2012: 108). However, when Tris and Tobias go into the factionless area, Tris sees that these people do indeed have their own sense of community. They are, perhaps ironically, a faction on their own. The text’s ideological project to criticise the singular thinking of the factions is undermined by the very existence of the factionless, who function as a community. They have their own norms and customs and their feeling of belonging is solidified by their enmity towards the factions that rejected them. They make a point of wearing colourful clothing and eating dinner together by “first heating the cans, then passing out spoons and forks, then passing cans around so everyone can have a bite of everything” (2012: 102). The leader of the factionless, Tobias’s mother Evelyn Johnson, tells Tobias:

“We want to usurp Erudite ... Once we get rid of them, there’s not much stopping us from controlling the government ourselves.”

“That’s what you expect me to help you with? Overthrowing one corrupt government and instating some kind of factionless tyranny.” He snorts. “Not a chance.”

“We don’t want to be tyrants,” she says. “We want to establish a new society. One without factions.”

My mouth goes dry. No factions? A world in which no one knows who they are or where they fit? I can’t even fathom it. I imagine only chaos and isolation. (2012:110)

The discourse in the excerpt firstly reveals that although the text seems to promote an ideology of fighting for freedom and establishing a government that is free of tyranny and oppression, the alternative that it presents shows the limitations of that ideology. Once Evelyn and her factionless troops succeed in usurping Erudite and eliminating Jeanine Matthews, she proves to be just as tyrannical as Jeanine, thereby making her the new antagonist for the remainder of the trilogy. By the end of *Insurgent*, her unwavering resolve to force the city to abandon its faction system only proves that the one tyrannical hegemony has been replaced by another. Secondly, the discourse reveals how strongly Tris and her society connect their notions of identity to the faction to which they are assigned. To them, a world without factions would be

a world in which all people are delinquents; in such a world, with no norm against which one's conduct and thinking can be measured, confusion, anarchy and loneliness would be the only imaginable outcome.

Signs of delinquency are shown by Tobias "Four" Eaton, Tris's love interest. Like the protagonist, Tobias is also Divergent, and although he is Abnegation born but Dauntless trained, he displays the values of selflessness, bravery and kindness in his actions. When Tris sees that Tobias has the symbols of all the factions tattooed on his body, he explains:

"I think we've made a mistake ... We've all started to put down the virtues of the other factions in the process of bolstering our own. I don't want to do that. I want to be brave, and selfless, *and* smart, *and* kind, *and* honest." (2011: 405)

For Foucault, "this delinquency, this anomaly, this deviation, this potential danger, this illness, this form of existence ... must be taken into account when the codes are rewritten" (1977: 255). Tobias's deviant nature is important because he realises before the central conflict of the novel arises that their current social arrangement, their faction "codes", has a restricting effect on how one's entire human identity is developed. He reflects that often it takes selflessness or kindness to be brave. Because Tobias disapproves of the violent Dauntless initiation and because he openly challenges brutal and cruel Dauntless characters such as Peter and Eric, his character proves the inter-connectedness of all of the values of the five factions. As a result of his reserved nature, and perhaps more importantly because of his parentage – his father the Abnegation leader and his mother the Factionless leader – Tobias's delinquency is not as threatening to him as it is to Tris. Not only does he manage to hide his divergence very well, but he also enjoys some protection from the high status of his parents. Nevertheless, although his delinquency is not viewed as the potential danger that Tris's is, it does have a profound impact on his sense of self and identity. In a chapter narrated by Tobias in the last novel, Tris and Tobias's genes are tested and the following is revealed:

"This is a map of Tobias's genes," Matthew says. "As you can see, he has the right genetic components for simulation awareness, but he doesn't have the same 'healed' genes that Tris does."

My throat is dry, and I feel like I've been given bad news, but I still haven't entirely grasped what that bad news is.

"What does that mean?" I ask.

"It means," Matthew says, "that you are not Divergent. Your genes are still damaged, but you have a genetic anomaly that allows you to be aware during

simulations anyway. You have, in other words, the appearance of a Divergent without actually being one.”

I process the information slowly, piece by piece. I’m not Divergent. I’m not like Tris. I’m genetically damaged.

The word “damaged” sinks inside me like it’s made of lead. I guess I always knew there was something wrong with me, but I thought it was because of my father, or my mother, and the pain they bequeathed to me like a family heirloom, handed down from generation to generation. (2013: 175-176)

Jacobs argues that “the subject is always constituting discourse as well as constituted by it, and can act only out of this dialectic process. If this is so, agency cannot be entirely a matter of individual autonomy” (2003: 95). This suggests that when Tobias and Tris lived in the faction-based society, their identity was connected to faction discourse, first to their birth faction and then to the faction they chose. Tobias chose to transfer to Dauntless because the Abnegation discourse was in conflict with the abuse he experienced from his father. His father made him feel scared and helpless, and in an attempt to detach himself from what such feelings may have instilled in his identity, he chose the faction that would equip him with the identity values he needed to overcome these feelings. For Ann Donchin, “the self-determining self is continually remaking itself in response to relationships that are seldom static” (Jacobs 2003: 95). As a young man, Tobias’s self exists very much in relation to others. Once he learns that he is Divergent, he embraces the label as a delinquent identity because it not only makes him unique, it also connects him to his love interest, Tris, and justifies his belief that he can be brave, selfless, smart, kind and honest while belonging to a faction. However, the discursive power of identity discourse is most prominent in the revelation that, not only are the factions a meaningless part of an experiment, but Tobias is no longer a unique and special Divergent. Rather, he is a broken and impure Genetically Damaged. Jacobs argues, “The possibility of free agency seems to disappear if the embodied self becomes endlessly variable if it is reduced to a particular configuration of genetic code, accessible to surveillance and manipulations by those in positions of social and financial power” (2003: 94). Once labelled Genetically Damaged, Tobias is considered to be another type of delinquent, only in this case the reason is not a matter of ineptitude, but a matter of biology, something over which he has no control. With this new identity label forced upon him, Tobias is confused and feels less like the person he used to be. The word ‘damage’ alone is enough to shock him and other characters to such a degree that their entire sense of self and worth, once attached to the group identity of their particular faction, is distorted. If he were to choose to stay outside of the city gates, he would simply be leaving one panopticon for another and functioning, once again, as a non-

conforming, undesirable delinquent. Inside the city, Tobias is constituted by Dauntless discourse and consequently has purpose and a sense of belonging; outside the city, Tobias is Genetically Damaged and is therefore expected to fall within that label's discursive formations, experiencing the same discrimination and social rejection that all GDs outside the city experiments are forced to accept.

Tris proves to be the embodiment of the ideal dystopian protagonist and panoptic delinquent from the outset of the trilogy until the moment of her death. In her first-person narrative, she expresses on multiple occasions how she struggles with conforming in her thoughts and feelings to the norms and values that are expected. Because her brain chemistry does not allow her to think singularly as the faction system requires, her flexible identity is in constant conflict with the social structures of her society. The day before her Choosing Ceremony, Tris reflects:

I walk into my room, and when I close my door behind me, I realize that the decision might be simple. It will require a great act of selflessness to choose Abnegation or a great act of courage to choose Dauntless, and maybe just choosing one over the other will prove that I belong. Tomorrow, those two qualities will struggle within me, and only one will win. (2011: 37)

Because Tris's society resides in a dystopian setting, as limited as her choices are, she does not take the importance of her choice lightly. As stated before, the threat of being factionless is a very real and immediate one for teenagers when they consider in what faction they will remain for the rest of their lives. Not being able to belong in a faction brings the threat of delinquency into immediate focus as it entails becoming that which does not belong in society and will involve suffering and isolation. Although Tris struggles to adapt her natural character to conform to the norms of her birth faction, not regarding herself as selfless enough, adapting her innate nature and her moulded Abnegation identity to her chosen faction proves similarly difficult:

I stare at my plate of food. I just grabbed what looked good to me at the time, and now that I take a closer look, I realise that I chose a plain chicken breast, a scoop of peas, and a slice of brown bread. Abnegation food.

I sigh. Abnegation is what I am. It's what I am when I'm not thinking about what I'm doing. It is what I am when I am put to the test. It is what I am even when I appear to be brave. Am I in the wrong faction? (2011: 379)

These discursive formations prove how strongly Tris's thoughts have been conditioned by a society that embraces uniform thinking. In this case, when Tris chooses, out of habit, the food she has eaten her entire childhood, her instinctive response is to think that she has chosen the wrong faction. An inherent contradiction is also apparent. The factions are different not only in their conduct and thought, but also in their foodstuffs and eating habits. The Abnegation take their meals together as a family, cook for each other, serve food to each other and eat plain and sometimes unappetising food. The Dauntless take their meals in a dining hall, throw their food around and are known for their cakes, muffins and junk food such as hamburgers. However, the fact that Tris could select plain food in the Dauntless compound suggests that what is known as Abnegation food is nevertheless *present* in the Dauntless dining hall. Even in something as mundane as food, the novels' focus on segregated social groups in order to underscore, by contrast, the divided nature of humanity, undermines the text's own awareness that human nature can never be fully partitioned into distinct groups that embrace only certain predetermined values.

Tris's delinquency can be further examined in her thoughts and conduct as she functions among other Dauntless. Typically, the Dauntless display their faction value of bravery through daring conduct such as jumping to and from a moving train, firing plastic bullets at food on friends' heads or zip-lining from the city's tallest building. But a flexible character such as Tris shows that the interpretation of the Dauntless faction values is in most cases subjective. Cruel and selfish Dauntless characters such as Eric and Peter believe that being fearless means being without weakness. To them, this requires asserting one's dominance over weaker persons at all times, proving that one is never scared of anyone or anything. However, one of the lines in the Dauntless manifesto states, "We believe in ordinary acts of bravery, in the courage that drives one person to stand up for another" (2011: 206). Tris lives up to this manifesto. When one of her friends, Al, is bullied by Eric, Al is forced to prove his bravery by standing in front of a knife-throwing target. Without flinching, Tris takes Al's place in front of the target. This extraordinary act of bravery stems from the innate selflessness she thinks she lacks. In this incident, Eric and Tris's peers see her conduct as a display of her toughness and resolve; in fact, it is when Tris acts selflessly that she is at her bravest. In a faction that trains its members to be dangerous weapons, it is important to temper such power with gentler behaviour so that people can distinguish between bravery and stupidity, between valour and cruelty and between honour and cowardice.

Perhaps a better example of Tris's selfless courage in protecting others is when she sacrifices herself for her brother Caleb at the end of the trilogy. While her death is not caused directly by her choice to perform a deadly task in her brother's stead, her death is an indirect result of her refusing to leave another, weaker person in a dangerous position when she can do something about it. Consciously and constantly placing herself in harm's way may seem like selfish stupidity to Tobias, but indeed in this dystopian world it should be viewed rather as the noble character of a delinquent who cannot come to terms with the reality of the carceral mechanisms of her reality.

The differences in Dauntless personality types prove how important delinquency is in a carceral society as they highlight the difference between power and the abuse of power. Moreover "when power is understood not as a monolithic structure that immobilizes all within its reach, but rather as a constantly shifting interplay of forces and tendencies, the self must be seen as a hybrid of many conflicting discursive formations; as a result of those very conflicts, spaces can open up for resistance, spontaneity, self-creation" (Jacobs 2003: 95). This suggests that the protagonist's deviant character is what makes it possible for all the oppressive power relations within a dystopian world to be questioned and resisted. Because delinquency contains discourse that is contradictory to that of the oppressive power, delinquency becomes a means of resistance in the power network. Thus, Tris's otherness is necessary in a dystopian narrative because it resists the collective norm of accepting a world in which individuals are grouped according to their values or according to their genes. Her delinquency illustrates the very fact that in order to be a fully functioning human being, one needs to embrace *all* the virtues of the five factions.

Tris becomes Roth's mechanism for expressing real-world issues that echo dystopian concerns about the flawed and unstable nature of humanity. Her speculative society is one that emerged because existing systems were failing and required rethinking. And yet, this too failed in a way. In its failure, perhaps it succeeds in shedding light on what makes contemporary social and political systems problematic; perhaps the flaws do not lie in the systems, but in the humans driving those systems.

Foucault maintains that "The carceral system combines in a single figure discourses and architectures, coercive regulations and scientific propositions, real social effects and invincible utopias, programmes for correcting delinquents and mechanisms that reinforce delinquency"

(1977: 271). The coercive power relations of the faction system and the genetic manipulation programmes in society in Roth's trilogy most certainly show that it is enclosed in a Foucauldian carceral city. Roth's imaginary city Chicago fulfils the conditions of the penitentiary as set out by Foucault: its aim is to transform the individual's behaviour so that it conforms to predetermined norms set by the hegemony; the citizens are isolated from the rest of the world and placed according to the needs of their society; the transformation and progressive socialisation of citizens is accomplished by enabling them to practise what they have learned in the form of employment; their education is focused on the interests of society; they are monitored and supervised at all times until full transformation has been achieved. The faction-based social system of Roth's trilogy disciplines its society through various carceral mechanisms because it "lays down for each individual his place, his body, ... his well-being, by means of an omnipresent and omniscient power that subdivides itself in a regular, uninterrupted way" (Foucault 1977: 197). The faction system creates within an individual a type of carceral identity because the thoughts and conduct of all of its citizens are restricted to being expressed through fixed identities. Added to this, the genetic experiments conducted by authoritarian figures not only attempted to correct delinquency by abolishing the 'evils' of human personality, but also succeeded in reinforcing delinquency by the ensuing discrimination and segregation between the Genetically Damaged and the Genetically Pure.

The panoptic nature of the society inside the gates of the futuristic city of Chicago and the society outside the gate, as well as the failure of the genetic manipulation experiments conducted by those in power highlight the fundamental dilemma presented by dystopian fiction: what cost is humanity willing to pay to create a better world? When Tris is asked what she thinks of the world outside her city, she responds, "Mostly the same ... People are just divided by different things, fighting different wars" (2013: 249). Societies both inside and outside the city gates have attempted to rectify a warring world by modifying human personality, whether by genetic manipulation or by grouping people into value-driven factions. As both societies still wage war in one form or another, their failure to eradicate this drive from humanity proves that their methods may not be the agents of change needed to improve society. Institutionalised conformity succeeds only in dividing people even further because it is the numerous and complex aspects of our human nature that are always at war within every individual self. The human identity is by nature a hybrid of many conflicting values and the conflicting nature of those values is important to maintain balance and avert chaos, not only in

the individual self but more importantly in society at large. As seen in Roth's novels, if any human value is allowed to evolve without its binary counterpart, the consequences may be dire. Perhaps these novels suggest that the focus of changing and improving society should not be on the carceral mechanisms imposed by authoritarian figures alone, but on the choices the rest of us make when we function within the societies that we already have.

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation I have examined how Huxley's *Brave New World*, Fforde's *Shades of Grey* and Roth's *Divergent* trilogy present potentially nightmarish future societies. In these novels, social and political 'improvements' have resulted in societies that are outwardly stable and happy, yet some essential part of human existence, such as freedom or individuality, has been sacrificed to establish and maintain a utopian existence. These fictional worlds reflect the carceral nature of modern society, highlighting what is problematic in the social and political practices to which individuals are expected to conform. They show that individuals need not necessarily be enclosed behind prison walls in order to be imprisoned, but that the very nature of their social systems provides the carceral mechanisms that restrict freedom and repress individuality and personal agency.

In Chapter 1, I discussed the development of the utopian/dystopian literary canon and examined how various scholars have expanded on the idea of dystopian strategies in literature. I revealed that dystopian novels express concerns about economic, moral and political crises in contemporary society through the use of flawed alternative societal designs of possible futuristic worlds. They express anti-utopian ideas that question the utopian spirit and express explicit disbelief in the possibility of realising utopian ideals. Moreover, their societies implement social and political alternatives that result in societies that are apparently stable and happy, yet their 'perfection' can only be accomplished by sacrificing freedom and individuality.

I also introduced post-structuralist discourse theory as the theoretical framework because of its connection to the dystopian notion of 'the carceral' as introduced by post-structuralist thinker Michel Foucault. I focused particularly on the instituted disciplinary mechanisms that have the principal function of imposing conformity as a means of pacification into acceptance of the state-sanctioned 'normal'. A deconstructive reading of the novels revealed the opposition between utopian and dystopian notions in order to expose their social and political criticisms. As the novels privilege neither utopian nor dystopian ideologies, there is no centre as Derrida suggests, because the internal contradictions within the text continuously expose the tension between utopian and dystopian notions present in the novels. This invites the reader to consider the cost of living as an individual in a utopian or a dystopian reality and whether the sacrifice

society is willing to pay for a perfect world by adopting alternative societal systems is worth it if it entails society remaining incarcerated by those very systems. The application of post-structuralist discourse theory has revealed that although a society of centralisation, surveillance and limitation of knowledge may bring about universal happiness, safety, security and stability, there is a cost to establishing and maintaining such a society. It is this cost – of knowledge, beauty, freedom, individuality and agency – that reflects the post-structuralist notion of the carceral: the very function of institutions of incarceration is to place restrictions on freedom, individuality and agency.

As post-structuralist theorists acknowledge the intangible nature and unreliability of all readings of texts, my application of post-structuralist theory has revealed that, through an interplay of oppositional views, the oppositional forces at play when utopian and dystopian themes are juxtaposed are highlighted. In this way, the discourse of the analysed novels reflects the carceral nature of their societies as these societies' citizens remain incarcerated by the disciplinary mechanisms embedded in their social systems.

In Chapter 2, I applied Foucault's model of the carceral city and its accompanying disciplinary mechanisms, together with Derrida's theory of deconstruction to examine Huxley's famous text *Brave New World*. My reading of the text revealed how in this novel conformity is mainly administered through the creation of a passive mindlessness that makes people unable to think, feel, or act in such a way as to question the social organisational model of their society. Various carceral mechanisms are in place that train members of society to conform to homogeneous thinking and behaviour. Firstly, humans are genetically designed according to the stringent stipulations of the class to which they will inevitably belong. Secondly, they are conditioned through Pavlovian theory and hypnopaedic sleep therapy to be content with their roles in society and function optimally within those roles. They are also conditioned to embrace the capitalist ideals of consumer culture. In addition, by conditioning society to engage in unrestrained sexual conduct as a norm, the hegemony ensures that the accumulation of potentially subversive political energies is suppressed, thereby minimising the potential for resistance. Lastly, the government produces and distributes the drug *soma*, a highly effective opiate used to keep people in a jovial daze that renders them incapable of resisting the power relations forced upon them.

A post-structuralist reading of Huxley's novel has revealed an opposition to this seemingly utopian setting of a technologically advanced, ultra-civilised, perfectly stable and perfectly happy society. The community of the Savage Reservation is in stark contrast to that of 'civilised' London, yet both societies are nevertheless carceral in nature. The Reservation is presented in all the rawness of human experience that 'civilised' society lacks; this might seem more desirable, and yet it is not the ideal alternative. Although perhaps less artificial, it is a violent and cruel place and many of its traditional practices cause the reader to question the morality and desirability of such an existence. Thus both societies are panopticons that use different carceral mechanisms, and neither society can be privileged as a more desirable means of social organisation or way of life. The text's own seeming contradictions reveal that neither progressive civilisation nor its primitive alternative is privileged by the text because, while raw human experience is subjugated in one society, that very raw human experience is exposed and criticised in the other.

My study of this novel has revealed that disciplinary power that is unconsciously internalised through the social organisation of society eliminates the need for violent enforcement of norms. In contrast to individuals who conform, John the Savage is unique in his identity and his concept of family. However, his life of intense self-punishment is just as empty and purposeless as the self-serving life of comfort and pleasure of the citizens of London. John's attempt to seek personal freedom through suffering and self-denial does not bring him the happiness, or the purpose which, to him, are essential to authentic human existence. Instead, he traps himself in another prison, himself. In this way, what is revealed is that society need not be imprisoned in a literal penitentiary to be in an incarcerated state; that the loss of individual freedom to be unique individuals with free thought and agency has the same restrictive power.

In Chapter 3, my analysis of Jasper Fforde's *Shades of Grey* reveals the post-structuralist notion that discourse creates social reality because language portrays how human behaviour is shaped by vocabulary and knowledge. Moreover, the satirical nature of the novel creates internal contradictions that highlight the tension between utopian and dystopian notions. The primary carceral mechanisms of this society are its strict social hierarchy and its obsession with colour perception, colour collection and social advancement. The carceral nature of Fforde's society lies primarily in the various restrictions imposed on members of society, as most aspects of their lives are strictly regulated.

My study of Fforde's novel exposes the carceral nature of social conformity as a means of suppressing natural human inquisitiveness. Strict adherence to the Rules is vigorously endorsed and monitored, preventing the questioning of the ridiculous and impractical nature of some of these Rules. Because knowledge is limited to what the hegemony dictates as acceptable, the people of this society live in complete ignorance of any other possible way of life than that with which they are presented. This technology of power ensures docility, reduces the risk of subversive energies and minimises the possibility of resistance.

The dystopian nature of Fforde's society is highlighted by the danger that delinquency poses for individuals. Any thoughts or actions that conflict with the established normal are documented, monitored and, when necessary, permanently removed from society. The fact that non-conformity may have lethal consequences is what gives this society its truly dystopian character: resistance to the existing power structures is never tolerated by conventional dystopian authorities. The insidiousness of this notion is further highlighted by the fact that people have been deceived into thinking that delinquents will be reformed for the good of society by being re-educated and reintroduced into society. In fact, delinquents are killed, revealing that the preservation of the status quo is more important than human lives and that the longevity of control over the population takes precedence over the creation of a better society.

In Chapter 4, I investigated how social conformity can shape a carceral identity in Veronica Roth's *Divergent* trilogy. My examination of this series of novels revealed that social conformity to the behavioural restrictions of a faction value system is the primarily reason Roth's futuristic Chicago and the world outside its gates are carceral in nature. The disciplinary mechanisms of both carceral societies emphasise homogeneity and subtle coercion as a means to discipline society into conformity. This social conformity to faction norms, together with surveillance, testing and control of agency consequently produces the definitive form of control and domination.

My post-structuralist reading reveals the undecidability of the notion of embracing a single value as one's ideology. The fundamental flaw in this social organisation model is that, instead of creating a utopia, it leads to a dystopian society, where the brave are cruel, the intelligent are vain, the kind are passive, the honest are tactless and the selfless are detached. The novels

therefore expose that the same mechanisms that were established to bring peace to a warring world have instead continued to bring about war, only in a different form.

My analysis of this trilogy has revealed that as the protagonist is unable to conform to the single value thinking of the faction system, the reader is made aware of the complexity and instability of human nature that post-structuralism suggests is embedded in language itself. Placing restrictions on one's thoughts and behaviour is not an adequate means to curb humanity's violent and destructive nature. Instead, a restrictive societal structure provides a larger space for resistance to power through the innate human desire to be free from all restrictions. Because societies both inside and outside the gates of Chicago fail to eradicate mankind's destructive nature, their instituted carceral mechanisms, intended initially to make positive change, can no longer be considered as the possible measures to bring about a better world.

The dystopian novels that have been analysed in this study present a chilling prospect of the future of mankind – a future where the dreams of paradise for some may be the ultimate nightmare of the prison for others. By highlighting the flaws in carceral societal designs, these novels advocate the necessity to reconsider what is truly problematic in our existing systems and to question why modern society is essentially carceral in nature. The novels reflect the idea that life inside and outside of carceral institutions is the same when the same societal restrictions are present. These speculative dystopian societies have been established because, in the context of these novels, existing systems have failed and require rethinking. These fictional societies succeed in highlighting what makes our systems problematic, while at the same time speculating what mankind might do to itself. The novels suggest that, perhaps, the faults do not reside in our social and political systems, but in those driving the system. They encourage us to consider the cost we are willing to pay to bring about a better world. Perhaps more portentously, they encourage us to consider what cost *others* are willing to pay *for us*. The exploration of alternative, possible realities is not only a form of critique and reflection but, more importantly, a crucial part of the process of changing the way we behave and think. Ultimately, unless the human race constantly reconsiders its own existence, with all its accommodating mechanisms and structures, it may never be able to escape the carceral reality that it has created for itself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, J. & Black, R. 2015. The Darker Side of the Sorting Hat: Representations of Educational Testing in Dystopian Young Adult Fiction. *Children's Literature* 43(1). Johns Hopkins University Press. 208-234
- Baccolini, R. 2004. The Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction. *PMLA*, 119(3), 518–521.
- Baccolini, R & T. Moylan, eds. 2003. *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. New York: Routledge.
- Bedore, P. 2017. *Great Utopian and Dystopian Works of Literature*. Course Guidebook. Virginia, USA: The Teaching Company.
- Bennington, G. 2002. Derrida and Politics. In T. Cohen ed. *Jacques Derrida and the Humanities: A Critical Reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 193-212.
- Bercovitch, S., ed.. 1996. Deconstruction and Poststructuralism. *The Cambridge History of American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 354-388.
- Bodnaruk, A. 2014. *Constructing Literary Dystopia: Exploring the divide between young adult and adult dystopian fictions*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Macquarie University.
<https://www.researchonline.mq.edu.au/vital/access/services/Download/mq:42078/SOURCE1> (Retrieved 21 September 2018)
- Booker, M.K. 1994. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Borrelli, C. 2013. Veronica Roth: The Next Literary Superstar? [Online] Available at: http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2013-10-21/entertainment/chi-veronica-roth-profile-20131021_1_veronica-roth-allegiant-anderson/2 (Accessed 21 May 2018)
- Bradley, A. 2008. *Derrida's Of Grammatology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Buggy, S. 2015. *Disciplining Dystopia: Power and the Body in Contemporary Young Adult Dystopian Fiction*, Unpublished doctoral thesis: University of Limerick.
- Castle, G. 2007. *The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory*. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell, 154-161.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1978. *Writing and difference*. Translated by A. Brass. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, London and Henley.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1998. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by G.C. Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

- Devido, B.A. 2012. *From Utopian Dreams to Twentieth-Century Dystopian Nightmares: Modern Fears of the World State and "Big Brother" in Huxley, Orwell, and Burgess*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Dominus, S. 2011. *In This Dystopia, Teens Must Choose Wisely*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/15/books/review/young-adult-books-divergent-by-veronica-roth.html> (Accessed 21 May 2018)
- Fforde, J. n.d. *Interview*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.jasperfforde.com/grey/interview.html>. (Accessed 15 March 2018)
- Fforde, J. n.d. *Ramblings*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.jasperfforde.com/grey/ramblings.html>. (Accessed 15 March 2018)
- Fforde, J. 2009. *Shades of Grey*. London: Penguin Books.
- Fitting, P. 2010. Utopia, Dystopia and Science Fiction. In G. Claeys, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.135-153.
- Fitting, P. 2009. A Short History of Utopian Studies. *Science Fiction Studies*, 36(1), 121-131.
- Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Translated by. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline & Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. Translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. 1978. *The History of Sexuality*. Translated by R. Hurley. New York. Pantheon Books
- Foucault, M. & Gordon, C. 1980. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fritz, S.S. 2016. Girl Power and Girl Activism in the Fiction of Suzanne Collins, Scott Westerfeld, and Moira Young. In L.J. Trudeau, ed. *Children's Literature Review*, vol. 203. [Online] Available at: http://0-link.galegroup.com/oasis.unisa.ac.za/apps/doc/JITRWR093883488/LCO?u=usa_itw&sid=LCO. (Accessed 12 June 2018)
- Grant, R. 1997. Anti-Meaning as Ideology: The Case of Deconstruction. In A. O'Hear, *Verstehen and Humane Understanding* (Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplements). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 253-286.
- Hardie, M. 2015. Post-Structuralism. In S. Herring, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to American Gay and Lesbian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 206-223.
- Hollinger, V. 2010. Deconstructing the Time Machine. *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism*, In L.J. Trudeau, ed. *Children's Literature Review*, vol. 234 [Online] Available at:

http://0-link.galegroup.com.oasis.unisa.ac.za/apps/doc/DELEVY353097319/LCO?u=usa_itw&sid=LCO. (Accessed 12 June 2018)

- Huisman, R., Murphet, J. & Dunn, A. 2005. From Structuralism to Post-Structuralism. In H. Fulton, ed. *Narrative and Media*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 28-44.
- Huxley, A. 1994. *Brave New World*. UK: Penguin Random House. (First published in 1932)
- Jacobs, N. 2003. Posthuman Bodies and Agency in Octavia Butler's *Xenogenesis*. In R. Baccolini & T. Moylan, eds. *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Impulse*. New York and London: Routledge, 13-27.
- Lane, A. 1977. *Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth*. London: Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.
- Levitas, R. & Sargisson, L. 2003. Utopia in Dark Times: Optimism/Pessimism and Utopia/Dystopia. In R. Baccolini & T. Moylan, eds. *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Impulse*. New York and London: Routledge, 13-27.
- Lock, A. & Strong, T. 2010. Discourse Analysis. In *Social Constructionism: Sources and Stirrings in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 244--294.
- Mambrol, N. 2016. *Foucault's concept of power*. [Online] Available at: <https://literariness.org/2016/04/05/foucaults-concept-of-power/>. (Accessed 15 March 2018)
- Mambrol, N. 2016. *Structuralism*. [Online] Available at: <https://literariness.org/2016/03/20/structuralism/>. (Accessed 15 March 2018)
- Mambrol, N. 2017. *Key Theories of Michel Foucault*. [Online] Available at: <https://literariness.org/2017/03/28/key-theories-of-michel-foucault/> (Accessed 15 March 2018)
- Miller, J. 2002. Derrida and literature. In T. Cohen, ed. *Jacques Derrida and the Humanities: A Critical Reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 58-81.
- Morrison, D. 2007. The Utopian Character of Plato's Ideal City. In G. Ferrari, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic (Cambridge Companions to Philosophy)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 232-255.
- Norris, C. 2014. Deconstruction: Theory and Practice. in SK. Day et al., eds. *Female Rebellion in Young Adult Dystopian Fiction*. London & New York: Methuen, 17-31.
- Paz, I.A. 2013. Discourse Theory. *Theory in Social and Cultural Anthropology: An Encyclopaedia*. 191-196. Available at https://www.academia.edu/2353856/Discourse_Theory (Accessed 15 March 2018)

- Peck, J. & Coyle, M. 1993. *Literary terms and criticism*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 165-199.
- Radwan, G.E. 2017. Quest for the Impossible: Conformity and Sameness in Two Science Fiction Dystopias: Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Lois Lowry's *The Giver* (1993). Harvard Square Symposium 2/2016 | The Phenomenon of Migration [Online] Available at: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.999608> (Accessed 15 March 2018)
- Rasiński, L. 2011. The Idea of Discourse in Poststructuralism: Derrida, Lacan and Foucault. *A Quarterly of Social and Educational Ideas*, Wrocław: University of Lower Silesia Press, 7-22.
- Rozak, S. 2016. Coming of age in a divided city: Cultural hybridity and ethnic injustice in Sandra Cisneros and Veronica Roth. *Children's Literature*, 44, 61-77.
- Roth, V. 2011. *Divergent*. London: HarperCollins.
- Roth, V. 2012. *Insurgent*. London: HarperCollins.
- Roth, V. 2013. *Allegiant*. London: HarperCollins.
- Rorty, R. 1995. Deconstruction. In R. Selden, ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 166-196.
- Rouse, J. 2005. Power/Knowledge. In G. Gutting, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault (Cambridge Companions to Philosophy)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 95-122.
- Schmeink, L. 2016. *Biopunk Dystopias: Genetic Engineering, Society and Science Fiction*, Liverpool University Press: Liverpool, 18-70.
- Seed, D. 2005. Introduction: Approaching Science Fiction. *A Companion to Science Fiction*. UK: Blackwell, 1-8.
- Seed, D. 2010. Aldous Huxley: Brave New World. In G. Claeys, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 477-488.
- Seed, D. 2011. *Science Fiction: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shippy, T. 2005. Hard reading: The Challenges of Science Fiction. In D. Seed, ed. *A Companion to Science Fiction*. UK: Blackwell, 11-26.
- Sonderling, S. 1994. An Exploration of Poststructuralist Discursive Critique and its Implication for a Critical Analysis of the Discourse on Pornography. Master's Thesis: University of South Africa, Pretoria. [Online] Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10500/16086>

- Suvin, D. 2003. Theses on Dystopia 2001. In: R. B Baccolini. & T. Moylan, eds. *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. New York and London: Routledge, 187-201.
- Tormey, S. 2012. Discourse Theories and Post-Structuralism. In R. Smith, A. Vromen, & I. Cook, eds. *Contemporary Politics in Australia: Theories, Practices and Issues* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 46-55.
- Trussel, P.T. 2009. *The Gift of Power: Foucault, Derrida, and Normalization*. Doctoral Thesis: Villanova University. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Tyson, L. 1999. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York & London: Garland Publishing.
- Varlik, N. 2015. The Black Death and Its Aftermath (1347–1453). In *Plague and Empire in the Early Modern Mediterranean World: The Ottoman Experience, 1347–1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 90-128.
- Varsam, M. 2003. Concrete Dystopia: Slavery and Its Others. In R. Baccolini & T. Moylan, eds. *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*, 203-231.
- Vieira, F. 2010. The Concept of Utopia. In: *The Cambridge companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-27.
- Wald, P. 2011. Science fiction. In C. Eby, B. Reiss & L. Cassuto, eds., *The Cambridge History of the American Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 832-846.
- Wegemer, G. 2011. Utopia. In *Young Thomas More and the Arts of Liberty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 139-159.
- Wegner, P.E. 2005. Utopia. In D. Seeds, ed. *A Companion to Science Fiction*. UK: Blackwell. pp.79-110.
- Whisnant, C.J. 2012. *Foucault & Discourse: A Handout for HIS 389*. [Online] Available at: http://webs.wofford.edu/whisnancj/his389/foucualt_discourse.pdf (Accessed 2 February 2019)
- Williams, R. 2019. Inventing New Worlds: The Age of Manifestos and Utopias. In G. Canavan & E. Link, eds. *The Cambridge History of Science Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 69-85.
- Wood, D. 1989. Beyond Deconstruction? In A. Griffiths, ed. *Contemporary French Philosophy (Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplements)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 175-194.